Adam's Condition IN PARADISE DISCOVERED:

Wherein is proved,

That *Adam* had right to Eternall Life, in Innocency; and forfeited it, for Him, and His.

ALSO,

A Treatise of the *Lawful Ministry*; and *The manner of* Sion's *Redemption* opened:

In Answer to a Book of *George Hammond*, a Taylor, of *Biddenden* in *Kent*; who calls himself Pastor of Christ's Church there: (And affirms, that *Adam's* Sin did bring but Temporal Death on him, and all in his Loyns; and that all his Enjoyments, in *Paradise*, were Earthly; That none yet are in Heaven or Hell; That the Jews shall return to their own Land, and enjoy it; That Christ shall reign in Earth a thousand years, &c.) The truth is asserted, and proved; and the Errours refuted,

By *Hezekiah Holland, Anglo-Hibernus* Minister of *Sutton-Valence* in *Kent*.

Geo. Hammond's Book, is, in part, an Answer to a Letter sent him from Mr. *Ruston*, about a former Dispute between them, about Original Sin, &c.

Who is this, who darkens counsel by words, without knowledge? Job 38.2.
Desiring to be Teachers of the Law, but understanding neither what they say, or whereof they affirm, 1 Tim. 1.7.
——*Contentionis quàm veritatis cupidiores*, Cic. Orat. l. 89.

London, Printed for *George Calvert*, at the Half-Moon in the New Buildings, in *Pauls* Church-yard, 1656.

Adam's Condition

IN

PARADISE

DISCOVERED:

To his benevolous Friend, Mr. *Maximilian Taylor* of *Sutton.*

SIR,

YOu remember how George Hammonds *Books were ſpread in my Pariſh: was it not time for me to look to my people? I took his Book, and (by way of preaching) anſwered and confuted its errours: when, I remember, you took notes, covetous to enform your own ſpirit of the truth; What you once heard preached, you have here printed by your timely encouragement. And indeed, though I owe more then my ſelf to many friends in and about* Sutton (*as to your noble Couſen Mr.* Edward Taylor, *of* Hollingborn; *to my ingenious Friend, M.* Edw. Knatchbull *of* Sutton; *to my bountiful Friend, Mr.* Tho: Tyndall; *to my Cordiall Friend, Mr.* James Lamb *of* Sutton) *yet this Book owes its ſelf to you (next to my ſelf) of all men under Heaven. For it lay by me as a dead thing, forgotten, till you revived my muſe, and your encouragements gave life to my Book. When* Satibarzanes (*who revolted from* Alexander *the great*) *challenged any of his Souldiers to fight,* (*as* George Hammon *almoſt doth the Clergy*); Erignis *an old, but ſpirited man, accepted the Challenge, with that expreſſion: What Souldiers* Alexander *once had, I'le ſhew you; and at the firſt On-ſet ſlew him. 'Tis a folly to think to conquer an* Anabaptiſt, perſuadebis & non perſuaſeris, *ſuch will take no anſwer. If I can*

strengthen my own people. I am well enough for my thinks, Reader. Mollio (in Erasmus's saying) that to go about to confute Hammon is but to goe about to measure the Land, &c. When I consider the many errours in his Book, I am thinking how he might have excused all with that jest in Lipsius, si vera dico agnoscite (those are rare): si falsa agnoscite; (that's most of your Book.) He much speaks against learning, & Oxford and Cambridge-knowledg: 'tis wisht he had more of their knowledge, that his book might have had fewer errours; but in that, he is but in the right. I finde errours of moment in his book not tolerable in a Common-wealth. As that Adams sin brought on him, and all in his loyns but temporall death, &c. Hence no Children eternally lost, or need Baptisme: (yet the Apostle sayes, One mans offence brought condemnation on all, Rom. 5. were we not by nature Sons of wrath? twice dead? by nature, and otherwise? Jude 12. Nay, born altogether in sins? Tres erraverunt, John 9. notwithstanding, the Pharisees obraiding the blind man. How the whole man was infected, is some difficulty: but as the blind man saw, John 9. 25. this one thing I know, I was blind, and now I see: and we did once see (in Adam) and now are naturally, miserable, poor, blind and naked, Rev. 3. I confesse, all in Adam sinned onely against the first Covenant; but that the breach of that Covenant merited no more then temporall death, I deny, because of Rom. 5. 18. That the souls of Adams progeny were in Adam, according to subsistence, I have proved, not according to essence. When the souls were created in disposed bodies, is controverted, yet Eustachius concludes in maribus circa diem a conceptu quadragesimum, in fœminis circa octogesimum, only excepts our Saviours body, whose conception was extraordinary. Another errour is, holding that actuall sins onely, make men Vessels of dishonour, p. 22. Dr. Usher denies sin to be the cause of Reprobation (and that

R. Answ. in the Book.

Tract. 4. de Anim. vat. Quæst. 2. Pag. 327.

Sum of Relig: Pag. 92.

that truly) onely the means to bring it about. Gods decree to be glorified in mercy and justice, is the first cause of all. Were not some fore-ordained to condemnation, Jude 4. read Exod. 9. 16. Prov. 16. 4. vvicked made for the day of destruction. God raised up Pharaoh for temporall ruine, but why not for eternall? it seems he hated him, nay hardened first his heart, Exod. 7. 3. so persons are reprobated by the means of sin, and thousands for onely Adams being by nature Children of wrath, and dying out of Christ. Again he denies Hell in being at present, or any in glory as yet, contrary to 2 Pet. 2. 8. Indeed such an Opinion was once, as appears by Revel. 14. 13. but Reformation cryed it down, Vers. 6. The great Humanist Dr. Fotherbey in his learned book against Atheists (given me by a good Friend) proves that Atheists are much tormented with fear at their dying hour. l. 2. c. 17. because of hell. And are not all souls of Saints alive unto God, Luke 20. 38? vvhere are souls departed? asleep for so many thousand of years? did not Moses and Elias talk with Jesus? Matth. 17. I thought Peter knew not what he said: it seems it was Moses and Elias, who talked in their sleep to Jesus. Why did God command a reward at Even to be payd to labouring men? Mat. 24. 14. since those who labour unto the death for him, have no reward till day of judgement? I will not much longer trouble you (Mr. Taylor) but refer you to the book: jamque tuum non meum (in the words of Erasmus): only when George Hammond, or any of that judgement say, that God would save more then he doth, believe them not, though Matth. 23. 37. speak that Language at first sight. Lombard or Moulin will enform you, that Christ did gather all ordained to life out of Jerusalem (ipsis sacerdotibus nolentibus) though the Scribes and Pharisees were unwilling to have it so. Who can hinder Gods work? Isay 53. 13.

See Answ. in the Book.

Mr. Tho: Barker of Chart.

Ep. Ded. to Sr. Tho: Moore.

De vol. Dei.

But

But to end, I fear my ſtudying to be brief, makes me too obſcure. I paſſe by George Hammonds *jeeres, as telling Mr.* Rutton, *that Hell was under his Coat: I could tell him, that except he repent of his errours, I would not be in his Coat one day for —— And 'tis well (though he call himſelfe Paſtor) if* Cyprians *words may not be made good of him and ſuch,* Non fidei duces ſed perfidiæ magiſtri, Nam paſtores ſunt impoſtores — *but farewell Sir, —— You know I am making haſte for* Ireland, *and 'tis well if my friends ſalute me not with the Poets words,* τίς, πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πῇ νηῦς ὧδε κέλευθον ἔσχεν; *having been abſent from them above a dozen years. Pray God make this poor pains of mine beneficiall to his people. Sir, I am your loving Friend and Servant,*

Lib. 1. Ep. 7.

Hom.

Sutton-valence
Febr. 3. 1655.

Hez. Holland.

Εἰς Ἀμμωνακιάδην.

Ῥᾳδίσιμῷ ἰχθὺς τι βρίθουσι, τὸ σῶμ' ἀναλέσαι,
Ταῦτ' ἀναγιναίσκων, τῶν λάζε σωότερον.

Θεῖ& ἐπιτήμης πολαμὸς καλάζαισι θελύδως,
Οὐ μὰ καύζε λίμας, τῆς δ' νόσημα φρενός.

Σημηλ Ὁ Ἐρασμῶ.

George

To *George Hammond*, of *Biddenden* in *Kent*.

SIR,

ONe of your judgment, having presented me with your book; which being dedicated to the Clergy, I thought with my self, that if I should have passed it by in silence, you might have said I was such an one as your self, according to Psal. 50. 21. or unable to answer you: for I confess you have gotten into great repute with those who know not how to contradict you. You have the substance of all your Book answered, and your material quotations of Scripture. I confess your Treatise of Original sinne, has more witty (if not wicked) arguments in it, than any piece written by any Heretick, since the Resurrection of our Saviour to this hour: and I know I have the Epitome of all Errours or Heresies from Christs time, to this lying by me. Therefore I shall be larger in answering that part of your book, but briefer (yet full enough) in considering Sions *Redemption*, being not so material. You have quoted many texts of Scripture, contrary to the purport or meaning thereof, as shall appear: I wonder a man for liberty of Conscience, should force the Text of Holy Writ to take your part volens nolens *against the intent of the Spirit thereof*: But I begin to consider your Examination of *Mr.* Rutton's *Letter about Baptism and Original Sinne.*

George Hammonds Examination of Mr. *Ruttons* Letter, *examined.*

Page 9. *Sprinkling of Infants is Baptiſme.*

WHere you ſay, that ſprinkling a little water in the face of a Child, is not Baptiſm, but a cozening ſhift brought in, by Pope *Innocent* the 3d. (what acquaintance you have gott with Popery of late!) and that *Baptizo* doth not ſignifie ſprinkling (but *Rantizo* doth) but onely to plunge, or over-whelm in water. Magiſterially ſpoken! Here I muſt conſider, firſt, that ſprinkling is nought. 2. Infant baptiſme, a cozening ſhift. 3. Pope *Innocent* the firſt Author of it. To the firſt, *baptizo* is taken for dipping or ſprinkling often: as *Mat.* 3. 11. ἀυτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ κ. λ. *He ſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt.* And pray, are not ſanctified men rather ſprinkled then plunged with the ſpirit? Are we not imperfect here below? knowing in part, and ſanctified in part? Again, in *Matth.* 20. 22. Chriſt ſayes, he has a Baptiſme to be baptized with, meaning that of his Paſſion; (as *Paræus* on the place.) Now Chriſt was rather ſprinkled, than plunged, in regard of outward man. Suppoſe the Thorns were on his head (indeed we read not of their pulling off) and Nailes and Spear wounding alſo, yet he was not wounded in each part of his body: Therefore, this Baptiſme rather was ſprinkling then plunging. And remember how the Parallel lies between *John's* Baptiſme with water, and Chriſts with ſpirit, *Act.* 1. 5. So if Chriſts giving the ſpirit (compared to powring, in reſpect

[a] *Eſt ergo baptiſma triplex; fluminis, flaminis, et ſanguinis.*

Jo. 20. 25.

ſpect of the few drops in the Law) be rather ſprinkling (for Chriſt onely was plunged with it (receiving it without meaſure) ſo was his Water-baptiſme, or elſe the Parallel is nothing, which the Evangeliſt from Chriſt urges: But what think you of that known place, in 1 *Cor.* 10. 2? All our Fathers * baptized in *Cloud and Sea*: 'Twas Water-baptiſme, yet they went on dry ground: ſome water might ſprinkle on them from the Sea, as they walked through, and a Cloud doth fall by drops (as Experience teſtifies) more like to ſprinkling, than plunging; eſpecially conſidering how little rain falls in thoſe parts, where *Iſrael* then was, if we will believe Travellers; or Reaſon, becauſe of the Suns exceſſive heat drying up the Clouds.

* *Cantizein, To dip or ſprinkle, Nizein To plunge, vide Paſor on the word Nizein or Baptiſo, theſe much differ.*

But what think you of the ſprinkling of bloud in the Law, ſo often mentioned? *Heb.* 9. 19. ὁ ῥαντίσας τὸν λαὸν. *He ſprinkled the people.* Was not it a type of Chriſts bloud, called the bloud of ſprinkling, *Heb.* 12. 24. And why ſhall not ſprinkling on Infants (ſignifying Chriſts bloud ſhed for them) be counted Baptiſme, ſince the word will carry it, unleſs you believe 'tis the muchneſs of water, and not the ſprinkled bloud of Chriſt (ſignified by Baptiſme) doth the work? *Peter* was once for a kind of plunging, *Joh.* 13. till better catechized by our Saviour, *ver.* 9, 10. I am ſure the Promiſe was of ſprinkling, † *Ezek.* 36. 25. and a Goſpel-promiſe. *Annotations of Aſſembly* refer us to *Epheſ.* 5. 26: for a farther illuſtration of the place: Chriſt gave himſelf for the Church, that he might ſanctifie it and cleanſe it by the waſhing of water, καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος. Sowhat ſprinkling is in *Ezekiel*, is waſhing in St. *Pauls* Expoſition; and why not ſometimes uſed indifferently, ſince the word *Baptize*, and Texts of Scripture will hold it out. The old *Common-Prayer Book* allowed of Dipping or Sprinkling, if our Climate could at all times ſuffer it. Our great Fonts in *England* ſhew our former Cuſtome; both have been uſed, Dipping and Sprinkling: but no way will pleaſe you, if Children be baptized, which we ſhall conſider anon: onely I wonder how the Jaylor and his could be plunged (baptized they were, *Act.* 16.) 'twas night, *ver.* 33. and in likelyhood, in the Priſon, into which he ſprang with a light, *ver.* 29. For though it's

† *Sanguine Jeſu Chriſti, ſayes Trem. on the place.*

said he called them forth, *ver.* 30. (that is, out of the inner prison into which they were thrust, *ver.* 24.) yet they are but brought into his house afterwards, *ver.* 34. So that the Jaylors houshold came out of the house to the Apostles, not the Apostles into the Jaylors house to preach: but be it in Gaole or House; where was water enough to plunge him, and his in so dry a Countrey? Did he venture, trow, to carry them to some River; his fear, if not his care, hindred. But had they a large tub of water there, and were they plunged: How came they, being very wet, to sit at meat presently with the Apostles rejoycing? But I forbear, perswading my self, they were contented with some sprinkling: of which, sayes one, instead of Baptisme, we have rather (the word bearing both significations) used *Rantisme*, considering the cold climes wherein we live. Yet I say, not that *Baptisme* and *Rantisme* are quite the same; but that *Baptizo* signifies sinkling sometimes, as well as Dipping: read *Leigh Cr. Sacra in verbum*, and Dr. *Featley, Dipper dipt.* Circumcision to *Israel* was as Baptisme to us: now that was not but in one part, read *Gen.* 17. and the Hebrew word for baptising (*tabbal*) signifies Washing in part, or Dipping: Read *Josh.* 3. 15. and the feet of the Priests that bare the Ark were dipped in the brim of the water: The word *Baptizo* doth signifie as much, therefore used for Sprinkling, moderate Washing, or Dipping; not Plunging. What the Apostle calls Washing, *Heb.* 9. 10, 13. (in Greek *Baptismous*) he expounds himself by Sprinkling *ver.* 19. 21. in Greek, *Rantismous*: so that *Baptizo* signifies Sprinkling; for their Baptismes, or Ceremonious Washings, were Sprinklings. We read of 3000. baptized at once, and no mention of any Rivers, *Act.* 2. 41. Therefore, in all likelyhood, Sprinklings were there used. But, to draw to a conclusion, we deny not, but Baptisme may include Dipping; but since it includes Sprinkling also, we use that out of care and tenderness to Infancy: For as the Sabbath was made for man, so Baptisme for our good, and not detriment; and therefore Sprinklings, in cold Climates, to be used rather; since the word will bear it.

Non pro baptismo rantismum pecius habeamus, hoc est aspersionem. Zep. de Sacram.

Tabbal LXX. *vide Mr. Hall quarterli, pag.* 114.

Infant Baptisme proved.

But I come to the second point, and prove, that Baptisme belongs to Children: First, because there was but one Covenant

venant ſince the Fall, (which in ſubſtance was Chriſt) though in reſpect of its ſeveral Adminiſtrations called Covenants, as being ſeveral ways adminiſtred; under the Law, by Circumciſion; under the Goſpel, by Baptiſme. Now if God allowed *Iſraels* Children the prerogative of Circumciſion under the Law, (as was accounted, *Rom.* 9.4.) ſhall we, under the Goſpel, be barred from an anſwerable priviledge in Baptiſme? You'l ſay, 'twas no priviledge, read *Rom.* 9. and conſider, *the fooliſhneſſe of God is wiſer then men, and the weakneſſe of God ſtronger then men*: in 1 *Cor.* 1, 25. *To be a marked ſheep, or Lamb of the flock of Iſrael, is a mercy.* 2. Believers Children are federally holy, 1 *Cor.* 7. therefore to be received by Baptiſme into the Church of Chriſt. 3. Children were baptized in the Cloud and Sea, 1 *Cor.* 10, 2. compared with *Exod.* 12.37. Theſe, the Apoſtle calls Fathers, to the ſucceeding *Iſraelites.* 4. As God owned thoſe Children preſented to him in Circumciſion, *Ezek.* 16.20, 21. and called them, his Children: So, we believe, he will own ours; eſpecially, conſidering 5. The promiſe to thoſe under the Goſpel, and their Children, *Act.* 2. 39. to them believing, and their Children, by vertue of the Parents Faith, (as to *Abraham* believing, and his Seed: for we have but one Covenant, Chriſt, by whom all are to expect Salvation) and to all afar off, when they believe; and to their Children, by vertue of their Faith; and to as many as God ſhall call to Faith, and to their Children, by vertue of that Faith. Hence the Apoſtle ſayes, *The Promiſe is made to you* (in Greek ἡ ἐπαγγελία) quoting that Promiſe made to *Adam Abraham*, and *Iſrael* of Chriſt Jeſus: and ſhall not we and ours partake of it, as well, as *Iſrael*, and their Children? Read *Rom.* 11. 17. *We partake of the fat of the Olive tree*; as, thoſe branches of Jews did before their cutting off; but they and their Children did; therefore we, and ours alſo. And here, by the way, obſerve, we plead a Church-priviledge for Children, to be, at leaſt in outward Covenant: we ſay not all of them ſhall be ſaved; we uſe the means, and leave the iſſue to God: There are ſome branches ſeemingly in Chriſt, who bring not forth fruit, *Joh.* 15. 1, 2. yet have the benefit of an external priviledge, as in *Iſrael*, † In *Mar.* 6. 10. *To ſuch belongs*

† *Mr. Marſhall againſt Mr. Tombs*, p. 138.

belongs the Kingdome of Heaven, must not be interpreted of all Children, (as such) but of Children, whose Parents were in the Covenant, as these were, and brought by Parents, or neer friends, to Christ; *suffer such to come to me*: You believe these were Children of Jews, yet in Covenant. Now though Christ baptized them not, nor any other, *Joh.*4.2. yet he laid his hands on them (A preparative to Baptisme in the primitive times, if you'l believe Antiquity†) and blessed them. (If Christ gave Children the greater benefit, Blessing, why do ye deny them the lesser, which is Baptisme?) Now I suppose you believe it was a spiritual blessing, being Christs gift, for *Esau* had a temporal and earthly (an heir of the world, as well as *Jacob*) yet he counted himself deceived of the blessing, *Gen.*27.36,37,39. Christ also affirmed, that to such (Children of Parents in Covenant) belongs the Kingdom of Heaven: Then deny not Baptisme to the heirs of heaven.

† *Read Doctor Hammond of baptizing Infants, p.*194.

*Read my Glim. of Christs love, p.*93.

But 7. What if *Matth.*28.19. make for Infant Baptisme? though (I wis) you take that Text for your Master-piece. *Go, disciplize all Nations*; for so is the Original. Pray, may not Children be made Disciples by Baptisme? read *Joh.*4.1,2,3. where Christ is said to make more Disciples than *John*, baptizing them, intimating the way to make Disciples, is, to baptize them, and after to teach them, *ver.* 20. Read it carefully, μαθητεύσατε, καὶ διδάσκοντες. So that though some small knowledge, and confession, or desire after Christ was required in grown people (none in Children) before Baptisme: yet most teaching, and consequently knowledge, was afterwards. And hence that passage of St. *Peter*, 1 Epist. 3. 21. is most admirably opened by a learned man, † not to be rendred, the Answer of a good Conscience (speaking of Baptisme) but the question, of a good Conscience toward God; for so the Original, ἐπερώτημα signifies. For men were discipulized with small quantity of knowledge, and children with none, but taught afterwards, and so asked after the things of God, and a good Conscience after its Baptisme. Now that Children are accounted Disciples, read *Act.*15.5. 10. where, when Circumcision was urged (which was most peculiar to Children) *Peter* answered [in that most famous Council

† *Dr. Hamond of Infant Baptisme, p.*196.

Council] why put ye a yoke on the Disciples, meaning on Believers, and their Children, under the Gospel: so Children were Disciples, and may be discipulized. You'l say, Why were not Children mentioned in the Commission? Answ. because needless: for what was oft mentioned in Old Testament, is more sparingly in the New: Now what more frequent in Old Testament, than to be a God to men, and their Seed, *Gen.* 17. [if well perpended] and (ye and your Children stand before God to make a Covenant, *Deut.* 11. 12.) where's a special command now for Sabbath, except 1 *Cor.* 16. 1. and that so variously read by Authors, that it seems not clear for that purpose? And Dr. *Heylin* † brings in many Expositions of those words, (upon the first day of the week, κατὰ μίαν σαββάτων) occasioned by the Greek words, which may be rendred, either upon one day of the week, or on the first day, or on the Sabbath day (for that day was observed, as well as the Lords day, many years after the Resurrection;) as Dr. *Heylin* observes out of *Gal.* 4. 10. (an Epistle written in the year 59. after Christ). And so far were the Primitive Christians from believing there was a Command to keep holy the first day of the week, that after Divine Exercises used in memoriall of their Saviours Resurrection, and other blessings which befell them that Day, they went to their common work the remainder of the Day: And the learned *Hierom* tells us, that a devout and pious woman, one *Paula*, who lived at *Bethlehem*, with certain poor Widows and Virgins privately, after they had been at the Holy Exercises of the Congregation one Lords Day, returned home to their common work, † which was making cloaths. This I the rather write, to shew, that what was commanded oft in Old Testament, is sparingly in the New. Now the Sabbath being morall (onely the Seventh Day changed into the first day of the week) what needed new Commands?

† *History of the Sabbath, part 2. c. 1. p. 26, 27.*

ut supra.

† *Instabant operiter vel sibi vel aliis vestimenta facienbant. See Heylyn Hist. Sab. part 2. c. 3. p. 79.*

And so for bringing Infants into Covenant in the New Testament, We have just grounds, having so many Commands in the old: if you say, that in 1 *Cor.* 16. 1. there is a Command for observing the Lords day, because 'tis said, As I have ordained in the Churches of *Galatia*, I answer, that relates rather to the collections there mentioned, then to the enforcing

forcing a Command for setting a part the Lords day: And, in a digression, we have a firmer Ordinance for Tythes (forgive that Jewish expression) in 1 *Cor.* 9. Even so has God ordained (διαταξε) that those that preach the Gospel, *&c.* the Apostle quotes a former Statute or Ordinance for Ministry-maintenance, and that seemes out of *Moses* Law, for *v.* 9. the Levitical Text is alledged, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the Oxe, *&c.* Now never did God appoint any † way to maintain those who did his service; but the way of Tythes, which was never type of any thing, nor never repealed; and indeed if *Moses* Priesthood had a set maintenance, why should our Saviours come short? And the Apostle pleads a set maintenance, Who goes to warre at his own charges, 1 *Cor.* 9. have not Souldiers set-pay? I could here be large with reason, but 'tis a digression. Here is a plainer Ordinance for Tythes, then for the Lords day, yet not looked on. What speciall Command have you for Womens partaking of the Pascall Lamb, or Lords Supper now? except you court that Text of 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. to take your part: Let a man examine himself, *&c.* and under man comprehend both sexes: the words are masculine (Ανθρωπος δοκιμαζετω εαυτον): but you'l say, The man is a courteous Creature to the woman, and will be content to comprehend her under him. Thus though in expresse terms in the new Testament, we are not commanded to baptize Children, nor keep Lords day, nor pay Tythes, nor admit Women to the Lords Supper, no nor to speak against Usury, or to hold Christiã Magistracy: yet by good consequences in the new, & Cõmands in the old Testament, or Rules that look very like Commands. My last Argument for Infant-baptisme, is in *Ephes.* 2. 3. since by nature they are Children of wrath; and therefore need Christs blood (represented in Baptisme) to wash away their sins: The baptizers say, the Text calles them Sons of wrath onely, who walked in sinful and evill courses; but I answer, That Exposition gives the Text the lye; for the Apostle there plainly shews, first, the *Ephesians* actuall transgressions, *v.* 2. and part of the third; and then their originall state in respect of *Adam*, they were by nature Children of wrath (of which more anon). Were not Children, when born, naturall Children?

Tythes in Gospel time proved.

† Free-will-offerings of a latter date.

Children? well then by nature Sons of wrath, which made them break forth into so many actuall sins, of which in v. 2. 3. here observe, because the *Ephesians* were elect, that their persons were ever beloved, but their state was the state or condition of wrath, in respect of originall sin; but thus much for Baptisme of Infants, I could produce more Arguments, and answer Objections, but 'tis not my task: there is abundant satisfaction to be had in Dr. *Feasley*, Mr. *Marshall*, Mr. *Hall*, Mr. *Fuller*, B. D. Dav. *Chytræus de infantum* Bapt. Mr. *Pagit*. *Rossæus*, and others, so that Mr. *Fishers* voluminous Book (where he calls Baby-Baptisme Babyisme) shall never prevail with me, to deny Childrens Baptism. The third thing you affirmed, was that Pope *Innocent* brought in Baptisme of Infants; but this is a most grosse error, for *Innocent* the third lived but about the year of our Lord 1198. and brought in Transubstantiation, and Auricular confession (as Dr. *Heylin* tells us) but Infant-Baptisme was in use above 1000. years before; but you are not the first who have fathered this Infant-Baptisme upon *Innocent* the third, as you may read in *Pagit* his *Hereseography*, page 16. Mr. *Marshall* against Mr. *Tombes*, has taken pains to prove the Antiquity of Infant-Baptisme, to have been in the year, 150. after Christ, in the dayes of *J. Martyr*, and produces his Testimony for it, which was long before any Pope of *Rome* was in being, and *Origene* who lived not very many years after, affirms Pædobaptisme to be a tradition received from the Apostles, [in whose time the word Tradition was used in a good sence, read 2 *Thes.* 2. 15.]. *Irenæus* a Grand Father, who lived in the same Century, with I. *Martyr* confirms Infant-Baptisme to have been in use in his time. You may read Mr. *Marshall*, who will also give you account why *Constantine*, *Greg. Nazianzen*, nor *Chrysostome*, *&c.* were baptized when Infants, to wit, because their Parents were not believers at their births. And having mentioned some of the Fathers, I wonder why you so speak against them for darkening the light of the Gospel. Some of them lived neer the Apostles times, saw them who heard the Apostles, and received light from their light; he that is wise will drink as near to the Fountains head as he can, be-

Person may be loved, and their State hated.

Description of *Italy*, pa. 184.

Pa. 92. 93, 94. &c.

Infant-Baptisme very antient.

Page 23. 24, 25. &c.

Scientia non habet inimicum nisi Ignorantem.

Dulcius ex ipso fonte &c. Fidelium filii sanctitatis candidati, & sancti ex seminis prærogativâ.

because of the pureneſs and clearneſs of the water. And indeed I believe the cauſe why you complain againſt them, is not for want of ignorance of their worth and abilities——. I could produce the teſtimony of *Tertullian* for Infant-Baptiſme, who lived in the ſame Century with *Irenæus*, who calles Children holy, in reſpect of their Prerogative in Generation, to wit, becauſe of believing Parents, and federally holy; but I refer the judicious Reader, to Dr. *Hammonds* Treatiſe of baptizing Infants, pag. 213. And I will wait upon what you ſay concerning *Adam's* ſin.

Tert. l. de Anima.

What puniſhment Adams ſin brought on his Poſterity.

Habuit vitam æternam partim promiſſione & ſpe. Paræus in cap. 2. Gen. p. 348.

THat *Adam's* ſin brought more on him and his, than temporall death, with ſorrows, ſickneſſes, *&c.* I prove 1. becauſe *Adam* forfeited eternall life, which I thus prove: what the ſecond *Adam* reſtored, the firſt loſt; but the ſecond *Adam*, reſtored eternall life, 2 *Tim.* 1. 10. who brought life and immortality to light, intimating it to have had ſome kinde of being before, to wit, in *Adam* at leaſt, in an incluſive promiſe (in feeding on the Tree of life, *&c.*) The Tree of life was the repreſenter of eternall life, and of Chriſt Jeſus, the means to bring it about upon the Fall, *Rev.* 2. 7. Hence *Paræus*, *Arbor vitæ eſt Chriſtus, paradiſus terrenus ſymbolum erat cæleſtis gratiæ, & ejectio è paradiſo ſignum æternæ abjectionis à Deo, niſi fuerit reconciliatus, ibid.* *Paradiſe* typed out glory the Tree of Life Chriſt, the ejecting man, ſignified mans rejection without reconciliation. Hence Dr. *Hall*, O infinite mercy! Man ſaw his Saviour before him, ere he had need of one; he ſaw him in whom he ſhould recover eternall life, ere he loſt it. Now that *Adam* was not promiſed eternall life in Paradiſe, has been the opinion of many: Mr. *Love* thought ſo, Mr. *Wotton* in his Sermons on *John* 1. v. 11. whoſe Arguments prevailed with me, to be once of that judgement. *Paræus* brings in 7. Arguments to prove, that *Adam* had not promiſe of eternall life in *Paradiſe*, but refutes them; proving, becauſe we loſt eternal life in him, therefore he had promiſe of it; and the Image of God in him, was the earneſt of it, the Tree of life a *ſymbolum*

In Gen. 1. 3.

Contemplation on Paradiſe. Sermons on Epheſ. 2. 12. Pag. 130. 131.

In Gen. cap. 2. Pag. 345.

Et ſanè multis ne contemnendis rationibus nititur hæc ſententia. Idem, ibid.

bolum of it; and Christs restoring life proves it lost in the first *Adam*. Here observe how differing Hereticks have been about this matter. *Pelagius* held (and *Socinus* after him) that *Adams* sin brought onely eternall Death, and that temporall Death was by nature not the wages of sin, because not removed by Christ. *Pighius* denies any to be guilty of eternall death, till they have actually sinned, the very Opinion of *George Hammond*: mark how he agrees in part with a Papist. Mark how Hereticks dissent among themselves; but consent (as *Pilate* and *Herod*) against truth. That place in the *Romans*, Chap. 5. 12, 14. proves, Death raigned over all who had not sinned actually as *Adam*, because we all sinned in *Adam*: of which at large anon. Now Christ was to remove onely eternall Death from Elect, and not temporal, onely its bitterness. And though it may be objected, that *Adam* had principles of mortality within him, before the Fall, yet he had never died, had he not sinned, which made *Paraus* say, he was in some sence mortal, in some immortal; and *Lombard* gives the distinction how, mortall in respect of body, ——immortall in respect of his Creator (whose will it was, had he not sinned, to have preserved him from Death, by feeding on the Tree of Life) but after the Fall, spirituall meat was not fit for a mortall stomack, sayes Dr. *Hall*. But let us consider the first Argument: What Christ restored, that *Adam* lost, but Christ restored eternall life. Hence *Adam* was called the figure or Type of Christ, *Rom.* 5. 14. therefore some similitude between *Adam's* losse, and Christs restauration, that as *Adam* lost eternall life (once) so Christ restored it. This I prove further, because Judgement came by one (*viz. Adam*) to condemnation, *Rom.* 5. 16. Here is damnation on all by *Adam*, not onely temporall Death. Now, that condemnation, there, is damnation, read the same *Greek* word in *Rom.* 8. 1. There is no condemnation to those that are, *&c.* that is, no damnation: read *John* 5. 24. This may be proved further, because we were all in *Adam*, Rom. 5. 12. and sinned all in him. Now the grounds are just, had *Adam* stood, we all had stood and lived for ever, therefore since he fell, we fell all in him; he being our representative or Parliament (as I may say) a common person,

Treat. de Orig. peccato Pag. 162.

L. 2. distinct. 19. p. 368.

Contemplation on Paradise.

κρίμα κατάδικον εἰς κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ.

the root of mankind. But you say, Our souls could not sin in
Page 15. *Adam*, because they were not in him, being not in being. To which I answer, We were in him enough to be guilty with him of his Sin. I'le shew you the most acute judgements of learned men, on that place of *Rom.* 5. 12. to give satisfaction to any indifferent man; but give me leave a little to play the Scholar with you: were not all souls and bodies in
Gen. 5. 3. *Adam*? then did not *Adam* beget a perfect or compleat Creature, as the Beasts do in their kinde. How did he beget a Son in his own likeness, meaning in sin? was *Adam*
Du Moulin ag. Armin. p. 66. c. 10. onely a body? can a body beget without a soul? was a sinfull body his likeness? can a body be well sinful without the soul? *Adam's* soul did first sin; there was the wills consent, before the hand took the fruit. Sin comes not chiefly by
Magister hic non approbatur. the body, nor a body can't sin nor beget alone. If *Adam* were onely a body, how got he a Childe in his own likeness? Indeed *Peter Lomb. l. 2. dist. 31.* affirms, sin to be onely from the body; but *Peter Du Moulin*, onely or chiefly from the soul; I believe from both in some sort. For the body, who
Creando infunditur, &c. can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? For the soul, it is created (though holy) yet destitute of its former Original righteousness, which deficiency to it, is sin: nay, That we
Amesius med. Theol. c. 17. Pag. 70. call original. The learned *Ames* tells us, that the want of Original righteousness may be considered as a punishment, or sin; As from God a soul is created in the body without it; 'tis a just judgement from God; but as that originall righteousness should be in our nature, and is not; *ipsa defi-*
Read his book pag. 15. *cientia est anima peccatum*, That deficiency is sin. Thus in jesting with my Antagonist, I have almost answered the Question, unless he oppose that souls are from God, not *Adam*, *Zach.* 12. 1. *Eccles.* 12. 7. *the soul returns to him that gave it*. It may be answered, *God gave it*, in giving *Adam* at first a power to get it: If that of *Heb.* 12. 9. where Fathers of flesh, are opposed to Father of spirits; and so Fathers of flesh there, are not Fathers of spirits; It may be answered,
Read *Paræus in Gen. c. 2. v. 7. p. 338. & Du Moulin. ag. Ar. p. 67.* that by Father of spirits, may be understood Father of Regeneration, because sanctifying our spirits. And we know *Augustine* was almost of this judgement to his dying day, who was *malleus Hereticorum*. Who doth desire more satis-

faction

faction, let him read the moſt elegant and learned reaſoning of Mr. *Nathaniel Culverwel*, in the eleventh Chapter of the light of nature, who would almoſt perſwade, that as *materia oritur ex materiâ*, ſo *forma ex formâ*, one ſoul may produce another, one doth print another with the ſame ſtamp of immortality, that it ſelf had engraven firſt upon it: one perſon of the ſacred Trinity produced another; one Candle lights another, *&c.* but I forbear, becauſe my *Parens* calls it, *bruta & pecuina opinio*, and ſo *Du Moulin*. Otherwiſe, if any had queſtioned, how an immateriall being had or could have conveyance in a ſeminall way, let them ſhew us the way how 'tis united to the body, & we will as eaſily tell them, how it entered into it; but lets not look for ſoul's Parentage on earth, We are of the off-ſpring of God, *Acts* 17. 28. *Prometheus* ſtole fire from Heaven, to quicken bodies, as the Poets fabulize. Pag. 106. Hebr. 1. τῶ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμὲν· πατὴρ δὲ ψυχῶν ἡμετέρων. Homer as *Virg.* hac ille *hominum ſator atque deorum.*

Yet we were all in *Adam*, and ſinned in him, *Rom.* 5.12. How did *Levi* pay Tithes in *Abraham? Heb.* 7. did his body and not ſoul? juſt ſo, friend *Hammond*, you pay Tithes now, without any conſent of the ſoul: when God ſaid to *Adam*, *the day* (*thou*) *eateſt thou ſhalt die*; ſpake God to *Adam's* body, without the ſoul? (I am ſo charitable to your ſelf, friend *Hammond*, to pay for all you will eat, be the meat never ſo coſtly, when your ſoul has left your body) or was ſoul and body both in *Adam*, and forbid eating? ſurely what God ſpake to *Adam*, he ſpake to all mankind in him, as he ſpake to him: well, he ſinned in ſoul and body, and we in his loyns: therefore his ſin is imputed to our whole man; But mark one hereſie of yours, worſe then that of *Pelagius*. You deny that Children were loſt, or endangered to be eternally loſt in *Adam*: how came they ſaved, what without Chriſt? no, ſure *Acts* 4. 12. will deny that; But did Chriſt ſave them? then they were loſt in *Adam*; for he came to ſave what was loſt, *Matth.* 18.11. and that Chapter ſpeaks of little Children, verſe 2. 3. whom the world offends, verſe 6, I believe in denying Church-priviledges to them. Let your Needle-ſhip well conſider this. *Wollebius* tells us, that *Adam* muſt be conſidered, not as a private perſon; (ſo you eſteem him, making our ſouls no way engaged *Omnes erant in Adamo, & peccarunt non aliter ſeducta, aliter inciderando originale peccatum quod iis imputatur in culpam, in quantum aliquo modo erant in primo parente & idem cum ipſo, ut Dion. Carthuſ in loc. Rom. Cap. 5. ut Lyra 92. ſuntura erant membra ipſius in Rom. 5.*

gaged in his) but as the Parent, head and root of all Mankind: So what he received for himself, and his (as the Image of God, and promise of Eternal Life, upon his obedience) he lost for him, and his,

Persona Ada infecit naturam & natura personas nostras, Wolleb. *l.* 1. *c.* 9.

But you'l say, How were our soules in *Adam?* I answer with the learned *Trelcatius*, the soul is not † out of *Adam*, or we in him, according to its essence, but according to its subsistence, *sive ὑποστάσει*: for though it be created of God, yet it is not created but in the body, neither has it subsistence before the body. You'l never be able to deny upon any good grounds, but that we were all in *Adam*, according to what is here said. God promised a soul to each one of *Adams* Posterity, just such, as he by obedience or disobedience should make them capable of: so by vertue of Covenant, or Promise, we were all in *Adam*; which Promise, might some way be included in that Command, *Increase and multiply*. (*a*) As many members are in one Body, or Individuals, in one Species, so we in *Adam*: As *Levi* was in *Abraham*, so we in *Adam*; *Levi* was in the Loyns of his Father, *Uti in arbore malum nondum enatum*, sayes *Bullinger*; as an apple in the Tree before Fruit-time. And so was our Saviour, both in *Adam* and *Abraham*: In *Adam*, the Nature sinned which he took, but it was not sinfull in his person, because conceived by the Holy Ghost: In *Abraham*, Christ in his servant-like condition may be said to have paid Tythes to *Melchizedeck*, the type of himself; though the learned *Diodate* thinks, Christ was not to be comprehended amongst the Tithe-payers (though in *Abrahams* Loyns) because as Son of God he was Priest, in whom his humane nature subsisted. The same Author tells us, All were in *Adam*, as in the main stock of all Generation, being the head and root of mankind. And the *Assemb. Annot.* use the same words on that place. *Pareus* sayes, we were all in *Adams* loyns, as part of him, and so his sinne was properly ours. The *Syriac* translation of *Tremellius* reads it, *By the hand of one man sinne entred*—— as if; when *Adam* took of the fruit, we all stretched

De Orig. pec. pag. 154. Trelcat.

a Dion Carthusian. in Rom. 5. 12.

b Bulling. in Heb. 7.

In Heb. 7. ver. 10. Joh. Diodati.

In Rom. 5. 12.

In Gen. 2. & pag. 409.

Totus homo totum hominem naturaliter generat Trel. *locus.*

† *Anima non est peccatum materiæ aut partis hominis, sed totius suppositi: communicat, quod materiale materialiter, quod immateriale causaliter.* pag. 153.

ed out our hands in his, and ate when he ate. † A learned Protestant Divine tells us that the whole man begets the whole man naturally: the materiall part he begets materially; the immateriall causally, as being the cause of it's subsistence in the body. And *Gorrhanus* expounding how we were in *Adam*, sayes, we were in *Adam*, as in the matter, not onely sinning by *Adams* example (as the Pelagians affirm) but we were in him, as in the cause, because his sinne was the cause of ours. *Gorrhanus* in *Rom.* 5. The *Greek* words may be read two wayes, either, By one mans offence sinne entred into the world, and Death by sinne, because all sinned: so the *Syriac* translation: and *Bulliger*, expounding it διὰ τοῦτο, for this cause: or else in whom all sinned, we being all legally in *Adam*, and by way of Equity and Justice, to stand and fall with him. And thus your Exposition of *Psal.* 51. 5. (*In sinne* I *was conceived*) falls to the ground, without any further Answer. For if *David* were conceived in sinne, there must be soul as well as body: Now the soul wants its original righteousnes, to guide and direct it, out of a just Judgment from God; which want to it, is sinne besides the bodies stains. So that what other Expositions you make on the Text, (which I shall not trouble the Reader with) are yours, not *Davids*, and sit beside the saddle. How *David's*, or any ones soul and body meet and work in the † contagion of sinne, I willingly pass by, and come to your objection out of *Ezek.* 18. *The Son shall not die for the Father:* Which falls to the ground by what has been said. I yield, An innocent Son shal not die for the Fathers sinne (as that Chapter means) but *Adam's* Sons were not such: in him we all sinned, *Rom.* 5. 12. As really as *Levi* paid Tythes in *Abraham's* Loyns, *Heb.* 7. But 2ly, that Chapter in *Ezek.* speaks onely of actual sins, not such as we have from *Adam*; therefore it proves nothing to purpose.

† *Concludimus nec in substantiâ animæ aut carnis hanc contagionem habere causam: sed quia a Deo sic fuit ordinatum &c. vide* Calvin, *instit.* l. 2. c. 1.

You draw an Argument against Childrens being defiled, (and that therefore they need not Baptisme, nor were corrupted in *Adam* in the inward man) *No defiled Creature can enter into Heaven*; but children are fit for the Kingdom of Heaven, therefore not defiled. Magisterially delivered! Answ. The Kingdom of Heaven is to be taken two wayes,

and

and Children to be looked upon under a two-fold condition. 1. The Kingdome of Heaven is to be taken for the Kingdom of Grace, according to *Mar.9.1.* and so in *Mat.* 11.12. Some were there standing, who tasted not Death, till the Kingdome of God came with power; till Christ owned, Churches gathered, Ordinances administred: Now Children of believing Parents, belong to this Kingdome, and it to them, though such as you bar them from the Ordinances of the Kingdom of Grace. 2. The Kingdom of Heaven is taken for glory, and no children fit for it, being all naturally defiled, and children of wrath. Now consider Childrens natural condition, and they are defiled, and their state a condition of wrath, But again, consider them as Elected and in the Eternal Covenant with God in Christ, and so all the persons of Election were ever beloved, and fitted for Heaven, by Justification, and Sanctification. That all vessels of mercy, are fitted or prepared for glory: Read *Rom.9.23.* and Col.1.12. Now I ask the question, Were children vessels of mercy, or no? I am sure, you'l say, yes: First, then, they were lost in *Adam*, and in misery (for mercy presupposeth misery.) And 2. then they must be fitted for glory, therefore not naturally fit. Dr. *Usher* tells us largely, in his book called, *The Sum and Substance of Christian Religion*, pag. 416. How Children, by Sanctification, are fitted for glory; and though by reason of ignorance, and tender youth, they are not capable of justification, as to understand it, yet they have nefit of that Eternall and Immanent act of God in Christ Jesus, in which he imputed their sins to Christ, and his righteousnesse to them, though the transient act were not perceived by them: Read Dr. *Kendal* against *Goodwins Redemption redeemed*, who will tell you, That if God did not some way act in Justification from Eternity, then God doth something in time, not formerly decreed, which argues some change in God. But I proceed, to examine your mind about *Esau* and *Jacob*: You conceive no Text proves *Esau's* Reprobation before born. I could produce the judgment of above a hundred famous Writers affirming it, but I'le come to reason, and argue thus: If God did not hate *Esau* before he was born, but after; then he loved him before he was born, but he

προετοίμασεν *Praeparavit*, Says *Beza*, in *Rom.9.23.* ἑτοιμασας *Idemtes licet non dignos fecit*, Col.1.

In his most learned Digression against Mr. *Baxter*. Pag.17,18.

Read Prov. 16.ver.4.

he loved him not; because, (1.) that would argue a change in God to love and hate the same person. 2. The 9. of *Rom.* sayes, God had a purpose about them before they were born, *ver.* 11. Was that purpose to love *Esau*, or hate him? If he loved him, how could he, without change, hate him? I perceive God after hated him: therefore, in all likelyhood, before he was born: for Gods Decrees are positive and unchangable; he calls the things that are not, as if they were, *Rom.* 4.17. He saw him condemned, before born; for Gods Decrees depend not upon man. 3. How comes *Malachy* to quote that place of *Gen.* 25. and, *Paul* to quote both, if not to one purpose? 'twas declared, the Elder should serve the Younger, before they were born; and St. *Paul* sayes, † *As it was written, Jacob have I loved*: To wit, before-born: And *Esau* have I hated; to wit, before-born. Or how comes else the Apostle to quote several Texts, if not one to explain another? Sure, none put an old piece to a new garment, or parallel texts where no agreement is. Pray, doth not the effect prove the same? Why found he no place in God, nor father, (to change his mind, after giving away the Blessing) nor in himself for Repentance, if not reprobated? And was not his servitude fore-told before born, a token of hatred? and *Jacobs* priviledge of Mastery over his Brother, fore-told, before born, an evident sign of love? I could proceed to enlarge my self on this subject, but I must study to be brief. You alleadge, *Ezek.* 33. 11. *that God desires not the death of sinners.* Answ. I confess, God desires not the ruine of any sinner who can repent; *Esau* could not to any purpose, *Heb.* 12. which was a sign of Rejection: For if Believing be a sign of Election, (as 'tis *Act.* 13.48.) then Unbelief and Non-penitency is a sign of Reprobation. God onely can give Repentance, in 2 *Tim.* 2. But, secondly, were these such wicked as *Esau*? Then I deny, that God ever intended them repentance more then to *Tyre* and *Sidon*, *Matth.* 11. 21. but men utterly appointed to destruction, as *Benhadad* in the Letter, 1 *King.* 20.42. and fore-ordained to Condemnation, *Jude* 4. For God desires Justice to be done to the Wicked. 3. Were not these Elected, but Wicked, while in their sins, whose ruine God would not have? But 4. this

* καθὼς γέγραπται, καθὼς (As) notes the likeness and coherency of the Texts.

Voluntas signi non beneplaciti.

expression shews Gods revealed Will, (if he spake to Reprobates) to make them some way unexcusable; not his concealed, or decretal will: of which anon. But you presse, 1 *Tim.* 2. God would have all to be saved. Pray consider, how the Apostle commands to pray for Kings there, and gives that Reason, because he would have all, *i. e.* all sorts of men to be saved; though Kings then did persecute Gods people much: And to that place, in 2 *Pet.* 3. 9. I answer, the Apostle speaks of the Saints, and Beloved, *v.* 1. and tells them, Why God was so slack in coming to judge Wicked; Why so patient, &c. that Gods long-suffering was to Us-ward (not the Wicked) *ver.* 9. Not willing that any; to wit, of us, the Elect, should perish &c. Pray, what have you got by these Texts though you brag of your acquaintance in Script: ob-rading Mr. *Ruton*, for not exercising therein, and for mi-
Pag. 19. stakes: Though I am confident, he is more able to expound the Bible, then thousands of such as you. You proceed, and would prove that *Rom.* 9. [*Has not the Potter power over the Clay*——] will prove nothing to our purpose; but would make the Apostle quote it out of *Jer.* 18. 6. Which Texts are not alike, nor have any agreement: for that of *Jeremy* either means, First, that the Potters work was *Adam*, and we in him: Secondly, *Adam's* marring, and we in him: Or else it means, 1. Gods work, in making them a people, Church, or State. aly, Their marring by disobedience, &c. But could ought be marred in Gods hand, against his will? Was he deceived of his work, or in it, as the Potter? Was *Adam* lost, or *Israel* ruined without God? and yet God is most holy, just, and good: the Evil from Man: the over-ruling from God.
Pag. 135. (Read my Comment upon *Rev. chap.* 17. *v.* 17. how God put it into the hearts of the Kings: how the matter of an action is from God: how the formality, or the obliquity is from man &c.) What made the Potter go about to make a vessel of honour, was it any worth in the clay? Was it desert in *Israel* caused God to make them a people? Or do you believe Election, and an Eternal Bosome of Love in God the Father? Was it not want of power made the Potter marre his Vessel? And doth God lack power † to save those who are lost? Could he have done no more to *Israel*, in

† *Read* Esay 43. 13. *I will work, and who can hinder?*

Esay

Esay 5? Then he must cease to be omnipotent, and cease to be God. He did enough to *Israel*, to make them inexcusable: He had power enough to save all the world, had he not otherwise decreed. But examine carefully, and you will find more in *Rom.* 9. then in *Jer.* 18. The former, pleads Gods Prerogative-Royall over all Creatures, making them such as he pleases, rejecting *Pharoah*, *Esau*, the Jews, though murmuring at it, *ver.* 19, 20. with that Expostulation, *Has not the Potter power over the Clay?* The latter, means *Israels* marring in Captivity, being first marred with sinfulness. Examine *Rom.* 9. and *Jer.* 18. and they will shew your mistake: For in *Jer.* the same Vessel is made; and being marred, is re-made into another form: But in *Rom.* 9. the Potter is said to have power, out of the same lump, to make one vessel to honour, and (another) to dishonour, as in *Jacob* and *Esau*: Pray, what agreement is here? Do not Reprobates murmure, *ver.* 19. saying, *Why hast thou made us so?* We were cast in *Adam*, and resisted not thy Will, till actuall transgression, before which we were cast: And why doth God yet find fault with us, since cast in *Adam*? To which, the Apostle answers out of Gods Prerogative, *Has not GOD (as well as a Potter) power over the clay of the same lump, (so we were in Adam) to make one vessel to honour, &c.)* Thus your Argument is marred in your hand, against your Will, as the Vessel in *Jeremies* Potter. I have said enough in answer to 2 *Tim.* 2. 20. already. We cannot make our selves Vessels of mercy, if once our persons were made vessels of wrath. There is a great gulf fixed, *Luk.* 16. They are by God before prepared for glory, *Rom.* 9. 23. who are vessels of mercy; onely man must co-work. Your Exposition of *Sodoms* suffering, will suffer much upon Examination. You deny the *Sodomites* to be in Hell, and that fire was called Eternal, because from Heaven, not kindled by man.

Read Prov. 16. 4. Exod. 9. 16. Rom. 9. 22.

Sodom now suffering punishment in Hell fire.

Answer, You almost deny, or give the Scripture the Lye: for *Jud.* 7. tells, that *Sodom* and *Gomorrha* are (suffering) the vengeance of Eternal Fire, that is, now in misery. Now the former fire is † out, which destroyed their bodies (for a great Lake called the *Asphaltite*, in the vacancy of Inhabitants, has taken possession of that Plain, where *Sodom*, &c. stood)

† *Sol in Pol. Hist. ca.* 48.

Lib 2, c. 13. p. 270. Read Mr. *Fullers Pisgah-sights of Palestine.* So, the fire in which the *Sodomites* suffer now, is Hell. *Jude* (in all probability) took part of his Epistle, out of the second Epistle of *Pet.* 2. 6. (Read Mr. *Fran. Roberts*, on *Jude.*) Though you would not have one man borrow of another, (pag. 69.) where *Peter* tells how the cases, or bodies, were destroyed: but *Jude* tells us of their now suffering; therefore the Jewels are by the Devill burning in Hell.

Key of Bible.

A priori, or *a posteriori.* I could laugh, and tell you, that if *Sodom's* fire were Eternall, it must be Eternal as God is, and then some Creature coeternal with the Creator, or to last for ever, and then Hell-fire and it will be kin to each other.

The Devill suffering in Hell. Now if the Devil actually suffers in Hell, then *Sodom*, as it is plain in *Jude* 5. 6. *The Angels which kept not their first habitation, even as* Sodom, *suffering the vengeance*, &c. But you deny the Devil yet suffers, p. 28. Read 2 *Pet.* 2. 4. *If God spared not the Angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell,* ταρταρώσας. What plainer? Now if Devils in Hell, then *Sodomites*, (for *Peter* and *Jude* parallel them) then children, then they deserved damnation in *Adam.* That Children suffer, we believe, because all in *Sodom* suffered, in which were Women and Children (young and old, sayes *Gen.* 19. 4.) And *John* saw such, *Rev.* 20. 12. small and great stand before God ready to be judged, therefore such are guilty.

Pag. 34. But you deny any soul yet in glory: What means *Rev.* 14. 13. *Blessed from henceforth are the dead?* And *Luk.* 23. 43. *This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise.* If you say, a day with the Lord is as a thousand years, 2 *Pet.* 3. 8. I answer, Christ meant it of a Natural Day: As *Jonah* was in the belly of the Whale three dayes, so the Son of Man in the Earth, *Matth.* 16. 4. And one of those three Naturall Days, Christ meant by, To day. But may some say, that Paradise is not heaven: Read 2 *Cor.* 12. 2—4. and be satisfied. For what the Apostle calls Heaven, v. 2. he calls Paradise v. 4. Now the Objections brought against Satans being in Hell, may be thus answered: though the fulness of torment be not till hereafter, when Christ shall take full vengeance, as

Saints now in glory.

2 *Thes.*

2 *Thes.* 1: 7, 8. & *Jude* 14. may be understood, yet the damned suffer in part, as is proved. You object *Matth.* 8. Why, art thou come to torment us before the time? Answ. They knew not how soon the day of judgement would come, and desired liberty to sin till then, then they knew they should be in full misery, 'twas recreation to them, to do hurt to poor Creatures, Christs miracles and preaching dispossessed them, and troubled or tormented them. Hell is the place of wicked, hence *Judas* went to his proper place, *Acts* 1. 25. Tell me, where are all the souls of Saints and wicked departed? *Revel.* 6. 10. sayes, the Saints soules were under the Altar, Christ; therefore in blisse. Christ sayes, All are alive to God, *Luke* 20. 38. therefore all Saints happy. But you say, the Devill is Prince of the Air, therefore not yet in torment: besides, Earth shall be Hell, *Isay* 24. Answ. though he exercise, under God, some Authority, yet he is in some torment, as is proved, 2 *Pet.* 2. 4. 'tis some pleasure to do hurt, hence they beg not to be dispossessed, *Mar.* 1, 24. chap. 5. 7. freedom and liberty from Hell is some pleasure: Hence they plead not to be cast into Hell, *Luke* 8. 31. which we render by, into the deep, which is Hell; for if by Deep, Hell were not meant, the Devills foolishly begged not to go into the deep, v. 31. and yet desired to enter into the Swine, and run into the Sea, v. 32, 33. You affirm, Hell will be in Earth, therefore none for the present. Your proof is in *Isay* 24: 21. God will punish the Kings of the Earth, in the Earth, or on it.

Matth. 17. 3.

In why discovered.

Read Pulor on that word.

Answer. Pray, what Kings of the Earth have not been punished by Gods hand, some by *Assyrians*, they by *Babylonians*, they by *Persians*, they by *Grecians*, &c. here on earth? then Hell is past, if the Text meant it. 2. High ones were punished, *i. e.* Emperours, Monarchs and petty Princes under them, whose Thrones were, as it were on earth, in respect of them, whose Throne was among the Starres (in conceit) *Isay* 14. 13. But if this place meant Hell, how could they be visited again, as v. 22. should their visitation be for better or worse? if for better, here's good news for damned: if for worse, pray what can be worse then Hell, especially if men be in full torment, as you mean by

Isay 24. 21. *opened and cleared.*

by this place, applying it after the day of judgement; but in brief, God punished Kings, but visited them again in temporalls, or their successors and Nations, with the Gospel of peace, in respect of whose glory, Sun and Moon were dim, when Christ (by ascension and sending the spirit, gathering Churches) reigned before *Israel* gloriously. In my conceit, when you say, Hell shall be on earth, and that darkness, no Sun nor Moon: you oppose your Tenet of the restauration of the Creation. In conclusion of your examination of Mr. *Huttons* letter, you say he asked you for a sign of your Ministry. You tell us, An adulterous Generation seeks for a signe. *John* came with no miracle, yet acknowledged for a true Teacher of Christ, *John* 10. 41. but I answer, if you have no more to plead for your being a Minister of Christ, then this lying book, you may read your doom in *Mat.* 7. 23. *Go, I know you not.* And thus much for your Examination of Mr. *Huttons* letter. You further argue, That if *Adam* had decreed against him eternall Death, and all in his loins upon his disobedience, and that not inflicted on them, then is God changeable, according to those that maintain that tenet, To decree a thing, and alter it argues a change; but God changes not: therefore.

Sed cum nullum fecit, ipse fuit miraculum.

God decreed not *Adams* eternall ruine, and all his, upon his fall inevitably.

Answ. God never decreed, that *Adam* and all his should eternally perish, God decreed to send Christ: therefore decreed not to eternally ruine *Adam* and his Posterity, which I prove thus. If God decreed not to send Christ to redeem man (foreseeing the fall) and that from eternity, then God did somewhat about Christ and mans salvation, not formerly decreed, or decreed in time (a strange and unheard of decree of God:) the same may be said of *Adam's* fall: was it decreed or not? If *Adam's* fall decreed (and God no way guilty) and Christs comming into the world, then not *Adam's* eternall inevitable ruine, because these are contrary; but these two last were decreed, *Adam's* fall and Christ comming to redeem man. So that though *Adam* were invested with right to eternall life, and forfeited it for him and his, yet Christ was partly in that decree, to bring all about again for Gods glory; and so no change in God: or plainer, God did not so inevitably decree *Adam's* ruine eternally, but that

Causa transgressionis Adami nec Deus nec decretum. 2. Interdixit homini à fructu & decretum non impellebat ad peccandum Wollch. cap. 9. & Canon. 1.

that Christ was in that decree, to bring life and immortality to light through the Gospel.

Now observe, Gods outward will is not alwayes, nay seldom, his decree: though he threatned *Adam*, he had not decreed inevitably his ruine. All Schoolmen allow of a concealed and revealed will (if I could render the words so, *voluntas signi & beneplaciti*) the former is unchangeable, not the latter. In the latter are 1. his threatnings (as to *Adam*, *Hezekiah*, and *Ninive*) 2. Commands as to *Pharaoh*, to let *Israel* go, and to *Abraham*, to sacrifice his Son, &c. here God changed his sentence, not his decretall will, which is most one and unchangeable. *Dr. Moulin* likes not this distinction, but Dr. *Kendall* maintains it; For plainer and for further satisfaction, read my Glimps of Christian love, page 21. 22. and come to the second Argument, wherein you say, that *Adam's* sin was onely against the first Covenant, (which is true) and in your third Argument, that all his enjoyments were onely earthly: now say you, the punishment of the first Covenant was onely temporall death, &c. and the sin against the second Covenant, onely, did deserve damnation in Hell: now Children in *Adam* sinned, but the first way, against the first Covenant.

Lomb. Lib. 1. & Distinc. 45. of Gods will, ex Patres Aquila. in 48. of Scotus distinc.

Answ. All in *Adam* sinned unto condemnation, or damnation, *Rom.* 5. 18. as is proved largely already, all being in his loyns, as before is maintained: if Children sinned onely against the first Covenant, (in your sence) how are they Children of wrath by nature, as is expounded before? how came they to enjoy Heaven? by Christ, or not? if by Christ, then they were lost, as if they had been in the second Covenant: if some go to Heaven without Christ, what means *Acts* 4. no other name men have to be saved by, but by the name of Jesus. Now though *Adam's* enjoyments are named most as earthly, did they not signifie, heavenly to be enjoyed upon obedience? was not *Paradise* a Type of Heaven? What meant Tree of Life, but eternall life? *Rev.* 2. 7. why was he not endued onely with an earthly soul? or what needed an immortall soul for onely earthly enjoyments? You do not wisely look unto the end and meaning of these things; but as the Jews on their sacrifices: or, as wil-

Breach of first Covenant deserved damnation, not onely a temporall Death.

willingly ignorant, as in 2 *Pet.* 3. 5. which is worse. I passe by your Exposition of 1 *Cor.* 15. what though Christ was the quickener after *Adam's* fall, and beyond *Adam?* was not *Adam* invested with an immortall soul? was he not superiour to the earthly condition of Beasts? had he not a *posse non mori?* what means that Text, *in dying, thou shalt die?* as the *Hebrew* has it, but in dying temporally, thou shalt die eternally, (according to Gods revealed will.) Read my Glimps, how many Deaths, p. 29. But suppose it but an *Hebrew* expression; yet under Death, all mans misery is contained as Death spirituall, *Rev.* 3. I know thy works, and that thou hast a name that thou art alive; but thou art dead, 2. the death of afflictions, as *Exod.* 10. Intreat the Lord, that he remove from me this death. 3. Death temporall, the body shall return to dust, *Eccles.* 12. 4. eternall death, as *Rev.* 21. called the second death; but I attend what you say in your fifth Argument, where you argue thus, That opinion which makes God a lyar, and the Devill tell true, is to be rejected; but that Opinion which holds, that *Adam* should die more then a temporall death, is such; for *Adam's* Posterity are not in Hell, onely die temporally, and Satan told them, ye shall not die, &c. but God said, ye shall surely die: therefore *Adam* was onely threatned with temporall death.

וממות

Wolleb. lib. 1. c. 12.

Answ. Your *Minor* is false; for though God threatned *Adam* with eternall Death, yet he lyed not, in not inflicting it, because his threatning was to deterr *Adam* from sinning, and not Gods peremptory resolution, but as to *Hezekiah* and *Nineveh*; for God had decreed before the salvation of the Elect in *Adam*, by Christ Jesus: therefore intended not their ruine; but of this already. Gods sentence was for Death, not his decree, except for Reprobates; but you that can excuse the Devill, and accuse God, according to this judgement: how did the Devill say true, do not men die temporally and eternally for first sin? By one mans offence judgment came upon all to condemnation, *Rom.* 5. 18. as the free gift in Christ Jesus, was to justification. Either say, Christ brought not justification to life by his obedience, or else conclude, *Adam* brought eternal condemnation (on

non-

non-Elect) by disobedience, or else say, there is no sence in the Apostles arguing, *Rom.* 5. 18. all were condemned to die temporally the day *Adam* sinned, but were repliev'd to increase the world: so all the Reprobates were condemned in *Adam* (fore ordained to condemnation in *Jude*) but judgement deferred for many Reasons, not remitted. Your sixth Argument is already answered, that tho Children bring into the world such sins, as make them liable to the second death, yet they may belong to Heaven, as I have shewed: the person of an Elect Vessel may be loved, sanctified in time——though the naturall condition were hated. And it were said for Children, if not naturally Children of wrath and lost, or else have no Saviour, if no sin, nor are to be found, if not lost. To such the Kingdom of grace belongs, by vertue of Parents faith. How prove you, that their Parents or friends that brought them, had not faith? they were Sons of Jews yet in Covenant, who had a good opinion of our Saviour, and in all likelihood, brought them for a spirituall end; or else how did Christ answer their expectation, in blessing them? You say *Matth.* 18. is not understood of Children in Age. What think you of vers. 2. Jesus called a little Childe? what think you of his placing him (which intimates the Childs youth and ignorance) from which Childe Christ sayes, men must be converted as Children. Goe then 1. Children are subjects of sanctification (which is part of conversion) or else go not to Heaven, because flesh and blood cannot, 1 *Cor.* 15. (2.) have faith, though not actually, yet the seeds and habit of faith, which will appear in time. (3.) may be offended, or you an offence to them, in denying them admittance into the Kingdom of grace by baptisme.

Matth. 18.

Of the Lawfull Miniſtry.

AND thus much of your Treatiſe of Originall Sin. I come briefly to your Characters of Miniſters: and ſhall tell you, that it would be too great an honour to you, to anſwer you at large in this particular; and it were to confeſs ſome guiltineſs in our Calling: Yet had you queſtioned our Office, or our Ordination, or our coming through the Church of *Rome*, I would have endeavoured to ſatisfie any ordinary man therein; and a word anon of it. However, I remember when *Scaliger* that proud Critick, had abuſed the noble *Engliſh* Nation, Dr. *Heylin* tells him, (as I can tell you) *A Fools bolt is ſoon ſhot*; and quotes *Socrates* Reſolution, εἰ μὴ ὄνος ἐλάκτισεν κ.τ.λ. *If an Aſs* (excuſe the expreſſion) *kick us, we muſt not put him in the Court*; the beſt is, *Many ſhoulders will make the burden light*. You endeavour to diſgrace all Miniſters, 'tis thought your mouth is no ſlander; ſuch wounds, are our glory. *Ambroſe* his Obſervation upon *Iſrael* diſowning the Prophet *Elias*, is ſeaſonable. *Corvi agnoſcebant prophetam Domini quem Judæi non agnoſcebant, paſcebant corvi quem genus illud perſequebatur*. The Ravens owned him for a Prophet of the Lord, whom the Jews diſowned; and fed him, whom thoſe people perſecuted.

Deſcription of Brit. p. 468.

L. 10. & Ep. 82.

1 *Tim.* 4. 14

Is not our Ordination good? We had Impoſition of hands by the Miniſtry, as *Timothy* (in ſome way) had. You'l ſay, Then the Spirit was given by Impoſition.—— Pray ſhew me a Reaſon, why we may not uſe the Ceremony, and hope for a bleſſing? Is not the weakneſs of God ſtronger then man? 1 *Cor.* 1. 25. And that μωρὸν θεοῦ *fooliſhneſs of God wiſer then men*? You'l ſay, We are ordained without conſent of People: I muſt tell you, that *Titus* (in all likelyhood) did ſo. *Paul* left him in *Crete*, ἵνα καταστήσῃς, to ordain Elders in every City, as *Paul* appointed. Now I know

no

no other Appointment, but by Imposition of hands: The people could not make them Ministers themselves, or by their choice; for then what need had *Paul* to have left *Titus* there? Again, the word implyes, that the power was in *Titus*: and so the same word is used, *Act.* 7. 10. The King of *Egypt* did appoint *Joseph* (καταστησεν, the same word) Governour of *Egypt*, where, I hope, the power was conceived to be in the King, not People: Which passage, *Philo Judæus* renders by βασιλεὺς ἔπεμψε καὶ χειροτονήσατο. As Dr. *Hammond* quotes him; intimating the power (as the Greek words used for Imposition of hands, or Setting apart, imply) to be in *Titus*, and the *Presbytery*, not People: though I should consent to the Peoples approbation, could it well be obtained. You'l say, our Ministry came from *Rome*. I answer, Suppose once Popery crept into *England*, have we not separated from all their Ceremonies, and keep close to the *word*, and shall we not be accepted? Or, could their Ceremony spoyl the substance? But I deny that we are of *Rome*, onely were in *Rome*, or came through it. And came not Christ from *Adam* through sinfull Loyns, and yet the true Christ? Did not *Aarons* Priesthood successively come to our Saviours time (*sed quære*) through sinful men, and yet owned by our Saviour? the Priesthood, not the Persons, who crucified him. And may not a Priesthood come undefiled through *Rome*, for matter of substance? But I'le prove we were Christians in *England*, and had Ministers before *Romes* Apostacies many years.

Concerning Ordination, pag. 314.

Our Histories make manifest, that *Augustine* the Monk was so far from being the first Planter of Christianity here, that he found Brit. Bishops, who did deny obedience to the Chu. of *Rome*, as appears by the B. of *Bangors* Letter, to *Aug.* the Monk, desiring his subjection to the *Romane* Church. *Notum sit vobis*, &c. *Nos esse sub gubernatione Episcopi Caerlegionis super Oscam*, &c. And before, Sir *Hen. Spelman*, out of the Annals of *Gisburn* cites, thus: *Ab urbe legionum Meneviam translata sedes Metropolitana tempore* S. David *Episcopi per Arthurum*, from *Caerlyon* upon *Osky* the Metropolitan Seat was translated to St. *Davids*, by King *Arthur*, in the time when St. *David* was Bishop, where there stood 13 chief Bishops, ——

The British Church, Independent from *Rome*.

Concil. Anglic. p. 188, and p. 236.

where Conſecration was, without making any ſubjection to any other Church. And *Lanfrank*, Biſhop of *Canterbury*, under *William* the Conquerour, refuſed to be ſubject to *Gregory* the 7. of *Rome*. Of which, read Dr. *Hammond*, who *pag.* 412. proves, That Chriſtianity was planted in *England*, in the Apoſtles time. *Oregine* confeſſeth, That Chriſtianity was in *England* in his time, (on *Ezek. Hom.* 4.) And *Tertullian* affirms here it before his time. Some gather ſom ground from 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. where *Creſcens* is ſent to *Galatia*, conceived to be *France*, from whence the Goſpel came to us. Mr. *Cambden* tells us from antient Authors, that *Joſeph* of *Arimathea* planted it here: but enough to prove, that our Original was not from *Rome*, though in after-time the Superſtition of *Rome* crept in amongſt us, which we have now forſaken, and are ordained according to the Goſpel-Rules.

Of Feſtivals of the *Church*, *pag.* 419.

Vindiciæ Miniſterii Evangelici.

Who deſires more ſatisfaction about Miniſters Ordination, let him read the learned Treatiſe of Mr. *John Collins*, proving, That gifted-men ſhould take the Seal of the Church by Ordination, as *Barnabas* and *Paul* did, *Act.* 13. where the Miniſtry, and not People, ſet them apart; as Chriſt did his Diſciples, *Act.* 10. 41. And the Greek word, when applyed to Eccleſiaſtical buſineſs, requires not the peoples conſent: Read Mr. *Vines* on 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. *pag.* 20. proving, that the Apoſtles ordain Elders without the peoples conſenting, or giving in Suffrages, *Act.* 14. 23. Read *Leigh* on the Word: Yet I am not againſt peoples choice alſo, where to be had conveniently. Read the *Diatribé*, printed 1647. proving, that many of our godly Reformers had onely inward Call, and Peoples Suffrages: now as Election makes a King more then his Coronation; ſo peoples Conſent, more then Ordination. But I forbear, knowing that the approbation of the Miniſtry (by reaſon of their abilities) is far beyond that of the people. Well! we have Miniſters both ways ſet apart, yet the Baptizers own them not. But ſo much in general about Miniſters, which your Characters cauſed me to ſay: yet you find fault rather with the perſonall faults of the Miniſtry, than with their Office: The Office is good, though a *Caiaphas*, or a *Judas* miſcarry in it: He, amongſt you, that's without fault, let him throw the firſt ſtone.

χειροτονήσαι-ες δυτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους. not συγχειροτονήσαντες.

The

The manner of Sions *Redemption discovered.*

NOw I come to examine your *Sion's Redemption*; in which you plead for the Jews return to their own Countrey. *Brightman* was of that Opinion, and that *Euphrates* therefore is to be miraculously dryed up, *Rev.* 16. that the Jews beyond *Euphrates* may not be hindred in their return: This Opinion *Paraus* calls godly and probable, but not solid. Read my Exposition of that Chapter, how *Euphrates* shall be dryed up: The Jews promise themselves an happy enjoyment of their Countrey. The learned *Rabbi*, in his *Book* dedicated to our long-liv'd-Parliament, tells us, that the Ten Tribes live together beyond the *Cordiller* Hills, and the River *Maragnon*, differing in Religion from the *Indians*, in whose Countrey they are. *Sed parvas spes habet, Troja, si tales habet.* For the Readers sake, I shall enlarge my self a little on this pleasant subject. The ten Tribes are threatned never to be a people more, in *Isaiah* 7.8. Pray, what hope of their return? And *Hosea* tells us of the Ten Tribes, God will love them no more (as to return them) God will cast them away, and they shall be wanderers amongst the Nations. Yet I believe there is hope of their Call, because *Rom.* 11. and that passage of *Tamars* Children prove in *Gen.* 38. 28. *Sarah* might represent the Jew, with the scarlet Thred, or Sacrifices, who first made proffer to serve God, as first-born, but drew back like a stiff-necked people; *Pharez*, in the mean time, steps forth, Behold the Gentiles call! but *Zarah* was born at last: the Jew then shall be a people belonging to God. Nay, I believe the dispersing the Ten Tribes will be a means to gain others to God upon their Call. Hence God is said to sow them among the people, (good seed shall not perish) and they shall remember me in far Countries.

How Sion redeemed.

In Rev. 16.

Rab. Men. Ben. Spes Israel

The Rabbi in his book, called, *Israelis.*

Chap. 9. 15, 16, 17.

The Jews return to *Judah* disproved.

Zach. 10. 10.

Now,

Now, though their return to *Gilead*, and to *Lebanon* be there, it must be spiritual: to wit, to the Church, or Spiritual Hierusalem, and that Spiritual Land of Promise. Read *An-*
Book Ch: 31. *not at, of Assembly* on the place. Hence, Mr. *Fuller* sayes of
pag. 5 *Israel converted*; *Any Mountain shall be their Olivet, River their Jordan, Field their Carmel, Forest their Lebanus, Fort their Sion, and City their Jerusalem.* I am the rather induced to believe this, because *Canaan* was their peculiar Land, whiles they, Gods peculiar people: now, the partition-wall is broken down. And as for *Judahs* return to the Land of *Canaan*, the Scripture is flat against it; as in *Zach.* 11.6. *I will no more pity the Inhabitants of the Land, and out of their enemies hands I will not deliver them.* And *Jeremy* tells us, God
Chap. 19, 11. will break this people, and this City, as a Potters vessel, which cannot be made whole again. *Ezekiel* is yet plainer, *Chap.* 16.53,55. *When Sodom and Gomorrha shall be restored to their former estate, and Samaria to hers, then shall Judah's Captivity*
Tostatus p. 375 *be restored.* That will never be; *Ierusalem*, sayes *Hierom*, *in aternos collapsa est Cineres.* Indeed, the Scepter was to depart from *Judah* when *Shilo* came. Their house is left desolate now, their Fig-tree cursed, and (wonder it was) their Land by the Romans was sold: Here was *Digitus Dei*, who sold no other Land but that, sayes *Mede*. But it may well be objected, That God promised them a return out of Captivity, (all his people, to wit) that he would have compassion on them, and remember them, *Deut.* 30.3. *Lev.* 26.44. Answ. Out of several calamities he did, and out of the Babylonish Captivity: But hitherto they had onely stoned the Prophets, and abused his servants; but when once they had murdered his son, his mercies (in returning them) were at an end for evermore. Hence forward any Text (good Reader) that promises the Jews a return, either understand it, out of the Babylonish Captivity, or construe it in a Spiritual sense, That the Jews shall return to God, or out of darkness, to light, and out of the power of Satan to Christ, to enjoy the true *Ierusalem*, and Celestial Land of *Canaan*. And thus, Friend *Hammond*, your Texts are answered; except that of *Esay* 60. which speaks chiefly of the glorious estate of the Church under *Messias*, described by the multitude of proselytes, and

those

those of chief note and place that should be joyned to it; so that the Heathens should bring in their riches, and joyn in the service of Christ. Hence you perceive, that Prophesie must not be taken literally, but spiritually: thus understand, *her opened gates*, v. 11. to admit proselytes and members; and by the City Jerusalem, the Church. Places which sound literally in the Prophets, must be spiritually expounded, and applied in the Gospel. Thus the Apostle expounds, *Amos* 9. 12. in *Act.* 15. 17. You proceed to prove, that *Israel* shall have their Temple re-built at their return, because *Ezekiel* saw a Temple, *Chap.* 41. *v.* 1. But *Ezekiels* Prophesie is spiritually to be looked on, as appears by the miraculous Fruit which never fades, *Chap.* 47. 12. And the strange waters in the beginning of that Chapter. Now as was the Waters and Fruit, so the Temple, Spirituall. The Temple was a Type, which is ended in Christ. The Saints are now the Temple, 1 *Cor.* 3. and *Jerusalem* the Church, *Gal.* 4.

The Iews not to enjoy their Temple.

Read Mr. *Th. Fuller* l. 5. c. 3.

I come to examine how the Jewes shall be converted: You say, Not by a Gospel-Ministry; but you greatly erre, not knowing the Scriptures. For,

First, *Rom.* 1. 16. confutes you, where the Apostle tells us, That the Gospel is the power of God to Salvation, to the Jew and Gentile.

Secondly, There is no other Name under Heaven, by which men must be saved, then by the name of Jesus, *Act.* 4. Now the Name of Christ is conveyed to men in a Gospell-way.

The Iews to be converted by the gospel.

Thirdly, the Jews shall (through our mercies) obtain mercy, *Rom.* 11. 31. that is, through Christ and his Gospel, for those are our infinite mercies; therefore, without doubt, the Jews are to be called by the Gospel, and not to wait in their Sacrifices, or Temple, for Christ.

Now, should not these Jewes be tolerated amongst Christians?

1. Because elected, *Rom.* 11. 28. and beloved.

2. Because Christians owe all to them, as having both Law and Gospel by their means, and we grow on their Root, *Rom.* 11. 18.

3. Be-

3. Because Christ left his glory (in part) for their sakes and he and his Disciples went after them.

4. Because they begin to read Christian Authors. (*Rabbi Menasseh Ben Israel* quotes *August. de Doct. Christiana, cap.* 28. *quo id omnes sunt aequè diligendi*, in his Book dedicated to our Lord Protector, *pag.* 23.

5. They will not sacrifice but at *Jerusalem*, as the same *Rabbi* testifies, *p.* 22.)

Tolleration of Jews.

6. And are no great Usurers of late, taking but 4 or 5 *per cent.* as he affirms, *p.* 20. But enough! You proceed to tell us, that the Witnesses in *Rev.* 11. are to dissuade the Jewes from believing in Antichrist; and not so much to preach Christ to them: But you do but say it; they will never take the Pope for their Messiah; and the work of the Witnesses is to draw people from Antichristianism, which had overrun all; but the Jews were not infected with Popery: therefore needed not the Witnesses help to deliver them from him. I have general acquaintance with a dozen and half of Commentaries on *Rev.* 11. And all believe (as I remember) that the Witnesses work, was to reform the Church (signified by the Temple, *Rev.* 11. 1, 2.) then over-spread with Popery: The Rod, like a Reed, is the * Word. So here your second proof for a Jewish Temple is void, because the Temple is not literally to be expounded, but spiritually. Other matters in your Argument, are answered above, where I proved, that by *Jerusalem*, is meant the Church: So, by the Temple, may the Worship be understood; and by the Courts, the Priests who officiated there, (as *Pareus* on the place affirms.) Yet *Piscator* thinks by the outward Court, the ungodly multitude is meant; whose time of Reformation was scarce come.

† Read my Exposition of Rev. Ch. 11.

In Rev. 11.

An easie Trope will give us leave to call the Court, the people, or to understand the people by the Court. Thus we say the *Court of Chancery*, and *Sutton Church*, though no people be there; though not the naked benches or stones, make Court or Church.

I come to your third Argument, to prove a Temple, because Antichrist shall sit in it, 2 *Thes.* 2. 4. But none but the ignorant

ignorant Paſtor (as he calls himſelf) of the Church at *Biddenden*, took that for a Jewiſh Temple: But for the Church over which Antichriſt raigned as Lord and King, too too long: of which anon. But ſuppoſe this a Jewiſh Temple, how doth the Apoſtle ſet forth Antichriſts tyranny, by ſaying, he ſate or ſet up his throne there: A poor honour! But he as God ſits, *in Templum Dei*, (as *Auguſtine* learnedly ſpeaks) for a Temple, or, inſtead of Temple, Oracle, Prieſt and all. But Chriſt has deſtroyed him, partly, by the Word and Spirit, (that breath of his mouth) and ſhall after confound him, by the brightneſs of his coming to judgment: Till when, Antichriſt will, in ſome meaſure, raign, and hinder your Saints 1000. years glory. But you deny the Pope to be Antichriſt: in troth he is beholding to you: but I believe him Antichriſt, (and you a limb of him. But what makes you huddle up ſo many texts together, to prove the man of ſins ariſing? *pag.* 101. I perceive you underſtand not, what is meant by Gog or Magog, like enough fore-runners of Antichriſt, as the little horn was a type of him, in *Dan.* 7. meaning that Tyrant *Antiochus Epiphanes*, (that ſagacious or cunning, but blaſphemous wretch). You quote *Eſay* 14. 13. to be underſtood of Antichriſt, which was plainly ſpoken of the King of *Babylon*, v. 4. And, 2 *Theſ.* 2. you will have underſtood of Antichriſt, not the Pope: Have you not been tutor'd by a Jeſuit? But let us try your Reaſons, why the Pope no Antichriſt.

εἰς τὸν ναὸν καθίσαι.

The Pope is Antichriſt.

First, becauſe the Pope, or rather Romiſh *Babylon*, is ſet forth by the name of a Woman: as *Rev.* 17. but Antichriſt is called the Man of ſinne, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 3.

Anſw. Antichriſt is ſet forth with a double form, *Rev.* 13. 4, 11. As Tyrant, and falſe Prophet; yet but one Beaſt, v. 18. So Antichriſt, as Woman, or Whoriſh Church ſeducing; but as Man (*viz.* the *Series* of Popes) tyrannizing.

Secondly, the Romiſh *Babylon* confeſſeth God; but Antichriſt ſhall exalt himſelf above all Gods, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 4.

Anſw. He ſhall confeſs him in words, but deny in deeds: ſo does Romiſh *Babylon*, or rather Pope, exalting himſelf above Angels and Kings, who are called Gods.

Qui ſcribit ſe ſervum ſervorum probat ſe tyrannum tyrannorum.

3. You say, That *Romish Babylon* shall be destroyed before the appearance of Christ, but Antichrist shall not.

Answ. The *Romish* Church shall be diminished before Christs appearance as Judge; but not quite destroyed: Partly, she is destroyed by the breath of Christs mouth (his word and spirit) already, and the rest by the brightness of his comming, 2 *Thes.* 2. 8. but you may finde that in *Rev.* 17. 17. and chap. 18. 18. the City of *Rome* is to be destroyed by fire; but the Pope shall survive, and the *Romish* Church (though diminished), till last day, 2 *Thes.* 2. 8. *Rev.* 19. 20. plainly.

Sancta Maria Regina cœli salva nos.

I could shew you many Arguments to prove the Pope Antichrist, as 1. Who is against the honour, Church, and truth of Christ, is Antichrist; such is the Pope, praying to Saints (which derogates from Christ) counting himself as head of the Church, remitting sins, bidding the Virgin Command her Son, &c.

Though he call himself Servus servorum Dei.

2. Who exalts himself above all that is called God, is Antichrist; but so doth the Pope, as above Emperours, Kings, nay Angels, who are called Gods. The *Lateran* Councel applauded the Pope, saying, Thou art all things, and above all things. And again, the same Councel said to him, thou art another God on earth. Read *Jewels* Apology, page 447. or *Aug. Civit. Dei. l.* 20. *c.* 19. expounding *in Templum*; or, *Annot.* of *Assemb.* on 2 *Thes.* 2. 4.

But 3dly. Who sits in the Seat of Antichrist, is Antichrist; but so doth the Pope on seven hills of *Rome*, Rev. 17. 9. where were seven Governments, and the Pope the eighth, trading for souls of men, *Rev.* 18. And in *Johns* time ruling over Nations, (*Rome* to wit, was the now seat of Antichrist,) what need further proof? ——— From your page 117. to 128. you almost trifle away Pen, Ink, and Paper: for my part I shall not fight with your shadow. Yet a word to what you say. You would prove, that upon the last return of the Jews to their Country, Antichrist, which you call *Gog*, out of *Ezek.* 38. shall destroy or spoil *Israel*, till Christ succour them. But, 1. The Jews shall return to their Country, is disproved already. 2. *Gog* is not litterally Antichrist (though an

an enemy to Christs Church.) By *Gog*, understand the people of *Asia*, so called from *Gigas* the King, by *Magog*, the *Scythians*; and by both understand the *Turk*, who came of them, and raigns over them. Now, though the *Gogims* did much spoyl *Israel* under *Antiochus*, and were overthrown by the *Macchabees* (God wonderfully assisting) upon the Mountains of *Israel*, in the latter dayes (not the last) *Ezek.* 38, 16, 21: Yet we expect a further destruction of the enemies of Gods Church, comprehended under *Gog* and *Magog*, *Turk*, &c. (Read *Rev.* 20.) which will hardly come to passe, till Christ come to judgement, *Rev.* 20. 9. when Christ shall come with flames of fire to destroy his enemies. But *Gog* cannot be Antichrist, because of Unbeliefe; for Antichrist must sit in the Temple, as owning *God*, &c. Now you would prove, that this *Gog* Antichrist, shall be destroyed by Christ, before the end, and quote *Rev.* 19. 21. to prove it; but that Text is meant of Christs comming to judgement, as appears by vers. 15. the sword comming out of Christs mouth, being his sentence to the wicked at the last day, when he shall slay them with, *Go ye cursed*, &c. Thus all warres (in the letter) on the Mountains of *Israel* are ended. And I come to examine Christs personall raign in earth 1000. years, when *Gog* and all enemies shall be subdued to him, where a thousand to one, but I shall finde you tardy. Your grand proof is, because Christ was to enjoy the Throne of *David*, *Luke* 1. which was not spirituall but temporall. But consider, Christ tells *Pilate*, that his Kingdom was not of the world, *John* 18. 36. in the sence that *Cæsars* was: so Christ must succeed *David* spiritually, because also, Of his Kingdom there must be no end, *Luke* 1. 33. Now by *Jacob* and *Israel* there, the Saints are meant, the true *Israel* of God: thus he is called King of Saints, *Rev.* 15, 3. And to this purpose, other Texts of Scripture must be understood, where Christ is called a King: that learned Sermon of Dr. *Goodwin* on *Rev.* 5. 10. (we shall raign on earth) speaks louder, and more to purpose then all other Books on that subject: yet because Christs Kingdom was spiritual before his ascension, I believe it will be so still,

Who *Gog* and *Magog*.

No warr with *Gog* on *Israels* Mount.

P. 128.

Christs personall Raign disproved as in Earth.

becauſe the Angels told the Diſciples ſo, *Acts* 1. 11. This ſame Jeſus ſhall ſo come in like manner, as you have ſeen him go into Heaven. So that *Parens* expounds the Saints raigning in earth ſpiritually, as they ſhall be Kings and Prieſts, to wit, ſacrificing ſin, raigning over wicked, by the ſpirit in them; for the head Chriſt raigning, the members raign; but the Weapons of our warfare are not carnall. The Saints raign in earth may be these wayes, firſt by their prayers, prevailing with God to bring judgements or bleſſings upon the earth: thus read *Iſay* 45. 11. Concerning the works of my hands, command ye me: how did *Moſes* and *Elias* even govern the world by their prayers? to ſay nothing of the witneſſes. (*Rev.* 11-2.) By being admitted into high priviledges in Heaven, of which 2 *Rev.* 17. *Dan.* 4. 17. holy ones with Chriſt, carrying on the Government of the world. What think you of *Rev.* 6. 10. How long O Lord? But you'l ſay, Saints know not what's done below: (therefore can't govern, or raign on earth, whiles in Heaven,) for *Iſay* 63. 16. ſayes, *Jacob* knowes us not, &c.

Saints Raign ſpirituall.

Saints knowledge of things below by Angels.

Anſw. Of themſelves, Saints above cannot tell whats don below, becauſe of their remoteneſs, and becauſe without bodies, —— but they have acquaintance of the affairs below, by means of Angels, who partly govern this world (under God) *Heb.* 2. 5. Now Angels and Saints can make matters known to one another, v. *Luke* 15. of joy in Heaven over one penitent ſinner: therefore Heaven (or Saints there) muſt know it. And in *Rev.* 18. 20. upon *Babylons* overthrow, Heaven, Prophets, and Apoſtles rejoyce, therefore knew of its overthrow; but enough. The grand objection againſt the ſpirituall raign of Chriſt onely, lies in *Dan.* 7. 27. a Kingdom under the whole Heavens ſhall be given to Saints, and v. 18. and v. 14. and this after the Beaſts body is given to be burned, vers. 11. But all this may be taken ſpiritually of Chriſts Kingdom upon earth, ruling and raigning in his Church; and thus the Saints building and planting (of Churches, to wit) and eating (*i. e.* feeding in Ordinances) may be ſpirituall: in *Iſay* 65. 22. without wreſting the Text; but let us briefly examine *Dan.* 7. The foure Beaſts are the foure Kingdoms,

doms. The fourth, some take to be, not the *Roman*, but the *Seleucidan* Kingdom of *Syria*, called a fourth, because not absolutely Monarchicall at present (for *Macedonia*, *Asia*, and *Egypt*, were Kingdoms also in the hands of *Alexanders* successors) as the former were, and more terrible to the Land of *Judea* and Saints, which the Beast even consumed, verse 23. The ten Horns were ten Kings in that Kingdom, from *Seleucus* to *Antiochus* (the little Horn) who was the tenth (as *Junius* proves) and last, that raigned over *Judea*, till Christs time. Well, in summ this Beast was slain by the *Parthians*, and King *Tygranes* of *Armenia*; and *Syria* made a *Roman* Province by *Pompey*: here is his ruine; meant by his bodies burning by consuming Warr, vers. 11, then the Saints time came according to promise, v. 18. 14. 27. quickly was Christ born the spirituall King; but where's the temporall Kingdom? Or suppose, by four Beasts, the *Roman* Monarch were meant, and by ten Horns, the ten Kings (or many) in *Rev.* 17. 12. (which arose out of the *Roman* Monarch) and suppose the Pope the little horn, typed by that in *Dan.* 7. Well, the Beast (be it the remainder of the *Roman* Monarch in *Turke*, Pope, &c.) and *Kings* of the earth (who adhered to him) are taken alive (as at last day) *Rev.* 19. 19, 20. and cast into Hell fire (I believe) now after this, sure no Kingdom for Saints, but that above in glory. For though in *Dan.* 7. the apparition of Gods judgement might not signifie the day of judgement; but Gods judgement on his then Churches enemies: yet in *Revel.* 19. 19 20. all things being well considered, the last day is meant (after which no temporall Kingdom) for Antichrist and Beast shall (in some sort) continue to the last, as 2 *Thes.* 1. 8. prove, and *Rev.* 19. 20. Now whiles these raign, where's Saints temporall Kingdom?

The same for substance with *Alexander*, but differing in ten horns, read *Annot.*

Read *Junius*, *Eng. Annot.* Diodati on *Dan.* 7.

Read my Exposition of Chap. 19. *Revel.*

But it may be demanded, Why were the lives of the other Beasts prolonged, after their dominion was taken away, *Dan.* 7. 12. if not, because Christ and Saints were temporally to raign over them? as *ver.* 13, 14.

Answ. 'Tis already plain, that Christ took not on him a temporal Kingdom.

2. The

2. The next Monarch prolonged the lives of the people, (who once belonged to these beasts) to raign over them. Every Empire or Enemy, in their time, perished; but the people thereof continued in some low form or state, till brought under by the Romans. But Christ is not to temporally raign in earth: read *John* 14.2. *I go to prepare a place for ye, (in heaven) that where I am, ye may be (not in earth).* And 1 *Thes.* 4.16. *We shall be caught up to Christ in the Air (when he comes to raise the Dead in Christ, who shall rise before the rest) and so we shall be ever with the Lord*; to wit, *raigning in the heaven, not on earth.* And *Act.* 3. 21. *Whom the heavens shall contain, till the time of the restitution of all things.* Now, Heaven and Earth is to be restored (of which a word anon) but that will not be, till after Wickeds Resurrection, *Rev.* 20.12,13. and Chap. 21.1,2. compared. For if the Earth be restored before wicked's resurrection, shall it be digged up again, or restored, to raise up wicked's bodies? Or must not their bodies be part of the glorified Earth? *redimite capitum.*

So Christ shall not come from heaven to raign before wickeds resurrection, which is against your tenet: but 1 *Cor.* 15. makes it plain, *ver.* 23,24. That Christ comes to judgment at the end of all, then comes the end: therefore, no time of temporal raigning for Saints after his coming: onely this Caveat I'le add, If Christ judge as man, then the day of the Lord may be as a 1000 years; all which time, the Saints shall judge the world with Christ: But what is this to a temporal raign? Besides, why should earth be preferred before heaven to raign in? And if those alive must eat and drink (as some esound, *Esay* 65. literally,) is not here Epicurism? Sure the Kingdome of God consists not in these things, *Rom.* 14.17. You may oppose, *Rev.* 20. where Saints are said to raign 1000 years: And 2 *Pet.* 3.13. we expect new Heavens and new Earth, wherein dwells righteousness.

Answ. Here is nothing will prove your design, *Paraus* has answered every Objection, and cleared any difficulty about the thousand years and first resurrection: briefly, Satan was bound up a thousand years, as not to hinder the propagation

t *Paraus* in *ev.* 20. *Read y Exposition, rv.* 20.

of

of the Gospel (though he raised persecution against the Professors thereof). The thousand years of Satans binding, in probability, began about the ruine of the Jewish Temple, *Anno Dom.* 73. (for while that Temple stood, the Jews much withstood the preaching of the Gospel; in which thousand years, multitudes of people believed, but were persecuted to death: these *John* sees living and raigning with Christ (in glory) those thousand years in which Satan was bound up; their conversion is called the first resurrection, being to grace (many being bodily raised in Old and New Testament before) answerable to Fall of Soul first into sinne. Now this was the first resurrection or conversion of soules to grace in the thousand years. Remember, *John* saw (visionally) the soules (not bodies) in heaven with Christ (not in earth) raigning after Death: Read my Exposition of that Chapter at large. To that of *Peter* I answer; the words may be read thus: *We, in whom dwels righteousness, expect a new heaven, and a new earth.* But a word of the renovation of the world, and of this new heaven, &c. and concerning the new Jerusalem: Of which, *George Hammond* pag. 151. speaks strangely: For he would have it to be a material City; but not made by man but God. I cannot believe it; for what City in the Letter can have twelve Foundations, as this has? *v.* 14. Or Angels Porters, to a material City? as *v.* 12. How can gates be made of pearl; or how one pearl big enough to make a whole gate? and such like improbabilities. Neither do I think this new Jerusalem to be that once possessed by the Jews, and now newly re-edified. Against which *George Hammond* uses many Arguments. But as Mr. *Roberts*, and Mr. *Forbes* agree, it may be spiritually taken for the state of the Church, after the Jews conversion, and after the whore and beast, with false Propher, and other enemies, are destroyed temporally, not damned. 1. Because the most precious things in Nature are too abject (rather then too high) to express the dispensation of grace (now at the highest.) 2. God is said to have his Tabernacle with men *ch.* 21. 3. (not men with God) and Jerusalem is said to come down out of heaven, intimating it here below. 3. That here is nothing here so magnificuely spoken,

Of the new Jerusalem.

Or Rev. 22.

which

which the Prophets have not almoſt in the ſame terms uttered of the eſtate of the Church here in grace. Of which, read the Authors themſelves on that place. Indeed, I believe a choice time, when the Jews ſhall be converted, called (*Rom.* 11.) Life from the Dead: yet ſince the day of judgment ſeems paſt before this City be ſeen; as *Chap.* 20. 12. and 21. 2. and Whore and Antichriſt damned *Ch.* 19. who were to laſt till Chriſts coming, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 8. I may belie.e with *Pareus*, That this City repreſents the ſtate of the Church in glory, becauſe actualled adorned, and fitted for Chriſt the husband, too high for a ſtate of grace: eſpecially conſidering all tears (and therefore enemies, nay and in the cauſe of tears) ſhall be wiped away: yet when the Son of man comes, ſhall he find faith in earth? *Jeruſalem*, in the Viſion, might ſeem to *John* to come down, not locally, but in reſpect of her Originall, which is from heaven. But enough: If we take *Ieruſalem* ſpiritually, as in earth, then by new Heaven, and new Earth, a new face of the Univerſe may be meant; (for Scripture, by new Heaven, and new Earth, is wont, ſayes Mr. *Roberts*, to expreſs great changes in the world.) Now when Whore, falſe Prophet, and Dragon are deſtroyed, here is a new world or new dweling, for the new Church. The bringing in the Eaſtern Kingdoms to the Faith, and deſtruction of all enemies of the *Church*, may *wel* be called, *A new Heaven, & new Earth.* But, if by *New Jeruſalem*, we underſtand the ſtate of glory; then by *New Heaven* &c. we underſtand Heaven and Earth, literally by fire to be renewed, according to *Peter*, and according to *Rom.* 8. 21, 22. (the hardeſt text in *Pauls* Epiſtles ſays D. *Hackwel* in *Ap.*) the whole Creature groans; &c. not ἐφθα, but πᾶσα κτίσις. I expect Sun and Moons reſtoring to more light, *Eſay* 30. 26. for reward of their unwearied labor, (though you will have Earth dark hereafter, *page* 12.) And I believe Sea may be reſtored, (though not with raging waves, &c.) to ſtand as a Monument of Gods wiſdome, mercy, and power: And I believe the Sons of God, in glory, may viſit theſe. But to expect reſtoring of each Tree, Leaf and Graſſe, nay, or beaſts (in what ſence you pleaſe) for which you argue, *p.* 154. is too carnal and beaſtly, if well examined; they

are

ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν.

κακοφραγμοσύνην τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τῷ πνεύματι.

Adorned for Husband, and not for Spouſe.

Eſay 65. 17. 66. 22.

Read *Engl. Anaſt. Diodat.* Key of the Bible, on *Rev.* 21

are not capable of glory: but, in their time, ſhall be freed from bondage; the Heaven and Earth, Sun and Moon, ſhall have that glory they are capable of; but I muſt be brief. Read my Expoſ. of *Rev. Chap.* 21. for further ſatisfaction. Thus I have done, Friend *Hammond*, as to the ſubſtance of your Book: I intended not to anſwer every trivial Objection, or to open each Text, impertinently quoted by whole Centuries; nay, forced together like *Sampſons* Foxes: I have civilly given them quarter (being violently forced to take up arms againſt the Truth) to return to their proper place in the book of God, to aſſert that cauſe God at firſt commanded them. I will not inſtance in any, to ſhew your ignorance, or diſcredit your knowledge; onely that laſt text of *Eſay* 11. *The Lyon ſhall eat with the Oxe*, you produce unadviſedly to prove, the reſtoration of Beaſts (if I underſtand you) which is underſtood of the moſt peaceable government of the Lord Jeſus, in changing our ſavage natures, and making us ſubmit freely to his yoak. To all the reſt of your *Book* I ſhall ſpeak but in few words: And firſt, to that place in *p.* 149. That as *Adam* had his Earthly Paradiſe; ſo ſhall Chriſt have his heavenly upon Earth, which is the new Jeruſalem: To which I ſhall agree, if you underſtand the (even) glorious condition of the Church here below upon the Call of the Jews, by the new Jeruſalem: or that glorified condition of the Church above, (for *Adams* Paradiſe was to repreſent the Celeſtiall, in which the Apoſtle was, 2 *Cor.* 12. 4.) but a temporal Paradiſe I deny, as well as Chriſts temporal raign. And when *p.* 154. you talk of the whole Creations re-enjoying the condition that it was in once in *Adams* Innocency, you ſpeak without book; for, *Rom.* 8. 21, 22. cannot hold it. I ask you, ſhall every Beaſt be ſo reſtored? The world is not able to contain them, no more then the Trees can hold every branch or leafe, or the fields every former graſs. But ſhall onely thoſe Beaſts have this priviledge, who are alive at the laſt day? Pray, why ſhould theſe have ſuch a priviledge above their fellow-Creatures and Partners in bondage? The World (Heaven and Earth) ſhall be reſtored to their primi-

Several paſſages in ſeverall pages of *Geo: Hammond's* Book; briefly anſwered.

tive glory, and better: But doth God take care of Oxen? 1 *Cor.* 9.9. but in page 159. you affirm, that Man and Beast must have a more quiet and peaceable time: for this is a time of persecution.

ὁ μέγας πρόμαχος ὑπόκωφα. *Answ.* Man shall hereafter; hardly, here below: For Christ, *Mark* 10.30. tells us, Saints have all here (or Grace Faith &c. which is, † *instar omnium*) with Persecution, but hereafter Eternal Life, here's little peace; though towards the end, the Sea, figuratively, shall be no more; that is, troubles, as formerly, according to them, who (by *Jerusalems* coming down from Heaven) hold the Churches even glorious and peaceable condition, after her enemies destruction.

τὰ ἀγαθά. To what you say in page 141. about the Saints possessing the riches of their Enemies (as true heirs to the riches of the world) I say this is a pleasant, but false doctrine.

For though Christ restored onely the Elect to Celestiall priviledges, yet he restored all to Temporal. Hence he gave Mount *Seir* to *Esau*, as really as *Canaan* to *Israel*. And *Luk.* 16.25. the Glutton is said to receive his good things. And indeed why should they be barred from Temporals, who have no share in Eternals? p. 168. You say that Nationall Congregations are not called the Church of Christ; nor her Ministers, Christs Ministers; and therefore you expect another kind of Preaching, to convert the Nations towards the end of the world.

Read my Expos. of Rev. 16. † 5. & 17. 15. *about Angels of waters.* National Ministers, are called the Angels of the waters, as those waters are expounded, *Rev.* 16.5. and 17.15. O profound Doctor!

But did not Christ bid his Disciples, discipulize all Nations, *Matth.* last. May there then not be a National Church, and National Ministers in a good sense? Pray, how came so many Nations converted, and by whom, if not by Nationall Ministers?

Ministers; Such Teachers as you, were not then in being; and 'tis well, if ye are not now born too soon. And thus, Friend *Hammond*, I take my leave of you, and your Book; which, like the Apples neer the *Asphaltite-Lake*, seem choice and pleasant: but being handled, moulder to dust, or nothing. *Solinus c.* 43.

Febr. 6. 1655.

FINIS.